Also, petition of citizens of Newfane and Mansfield, N. Y., against religious legislation for the District of Columbia (H. R. 4897)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of S. Chester Towne and other citizens of New York, favoring a national highways commission and appropriation for Federal aid in construction and improvement of highways (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of County Board of Ancient Order of Hibernians of Erie County, N. Y., against ratification of a treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of Railroad Telegraphers of the United States, against the enactment of H. R. 19238—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: Petition of soldiers of the civil war and members of Fairchild Post, No. 16, Grand Army of the Republic, and other soldiers of Tulsa and of Claremore and vicinity, Okla., favoring the Sherwood pension bill, providing a pension of $1 per day for all honorably discharged Union soldiers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolution of New Haven Lodge, No. 21, Order B'rith Abraham, of New Haven, Conn., against legislation providing for an educational test, certificate of character, and money-in-the-pocket feature, as outlined in the Latimer or Gardner bills—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of National Association of Manufacturers of United States, against the Hepburn amendment to the Sherman antitrust act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of St. Louis national banks, against the Aldrich currency bill (S. 3023)—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of New York, against H. R. 19245, to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to prevent obstructive deposits in New York Harbor and adjacent waters"—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of New York, for S. 4355 and 4356, to increase salaries of district and circuit judges—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Union Veteran Legion Encampment and citizens of Fort Wayne, for an appropriation of $200,000 for an armory building on site of old fort built by Gen. Anthony Wayne—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Petition of numerous manufacturing establishments and business houses of Winona, Minn., against the Aldrich currency bill (S. 3023)—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: Petition of Charles Green, on behalf of 300 District of Columbia prisoners confined in West Virginia penitentiary, for the benefits of the parole law (sec. 5539, R. S.)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Rev. John F. Sheppard and other citizens of Conshohocken, Pa., for legislation to restrain impurity, intemperance, Sabbath breaking, and gambling; for the Littlefield original-package bill, and the Tirrell bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WASHBURN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Maritz Schultz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Frank H. Benedict and others, of Sutton, Mass., for highway improvement (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *April 10, 1908.*

[*Continuation of the legislative day of Monday, April 6, 1908.*]

The recess having expired, the House, at 11 o'clock and 30 minutes a. m., was called to order by the Speaker.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House the Chair declares the House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill under the terms of the rule adopted, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] will take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 20471, the naval appropriation bill. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20471) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, and for other purposes.

Mr. FOSS. I understood that under the rule which was adopted the first reading of the bill was dispensed with in regard to all appropriation bills.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that the rule contains nothing on the subject.

Mr. FOSS. Well, Mr. Chairman, in the absence of any language on the subject, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, what is the request?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the naval appropriation bill be dispensed with.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Under the special rule that would cut off debate just to that extent, and I shall not object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, the naval appropriation bill carries an appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, of $103,967,518. The estimates which were submitted by the Department to this House and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs amounted to $125,041,349, but the committee, after hearings and careful consideration of the needs of the different bureaus of the naval service, reported this bill with a reduction from these estimates amounting to $22,518,831. I have submitted an extensive report upon the appropriations carried in this bill, and upon the projected naval programmes of foreign countries, but there is one mistake in the report which I desire to correct at this time, and that relates to the naval programme of England for the coming year.

I have received this letter from the Office of Naval Intelligence correcting the statement which appears upon page 24 in the report on the English programme for 1908. It is stated there that the naval programme for England is two battle ships, four medium-sized armored cruisers, one large seagoing destroyer, and some ocean-going destroyers, and so forth. In place of that I desire to insert that the naval estimates that have just been submitted to Parliament, in England, provide for one battle ship, one large armored cruiser, eight fast protected cruisers, and sixteen torpedo-boat destroyers, and a number of submarines, to cost $2,433,250.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one word in regard to the personnel of the Navy. As Farragut once said, "It takes two things to make up a navy—first, men, and then ships, but the most important is men." I will say that to-day we have a shortage of officers. In order to officer all the ships which are now being built for the Navy it will be necessary to have a considerable increase in the number of officers, but in view of the fact that we have increased the number of midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and these large classes will be graduating from now on, we will be able to make up this shortage which now exists.

Now, in regard to the men in the Navy. Under our present law we have 36,000 men in the Navy. Never before perhaps in the history of the new Navy have we had our quota filled until this year. The recruiting has been exceptionally good, and when the Secretary of the Navy appeared before the committee he stated in his hearing that the Navy was within 600 of the full quota of men authorized by law. During the last year there were a great many applicants for admission into the Navy; more than 45,000 men applied for admission; and to show you with what care men are selected, I will state what appears in the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, that of these applicants only about 14,000 were actually taken into the Navy. Not only that, but the character of the men who are coming into the Navy to-day is better than ever before. They are coming from the Western farms and prairies; and while they come into the Navy without any knowledge of naval affairs, yet, under the course of training which is pursued at our different naval training stations, in a short time they become expert seamen. And there has never been a time in the history of the American Navy when the personnel stood so high in character, intelligence, and in patriotism as it does at this hour. [Applause.]

Another thing that I will say for the American Navy is that our desertions during the past year has been falling off—a less percentage than we had last year. Then also the citizenship of the Navy is improving. A number of years ago there were a great many foreigners in our Navy, but to-day, as the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation reports in his report as it appears on page 20, the Bureau during the year has gone even further to reduce the number of aliens in the Navy by providing that no one can enter the Navy on the first enlistment who is not a full citizen of the United States. To-day we have a number of foreigners, but a very small percentage, and that percentage is growing less and less as the years run on. For instance, among the petty officers the percentage of American citizens is 96.5; among the enlisted men it is 93.2, and among the citizens, taking in the whole

enlisted force of the Navy—citizens of the United States—it is 94.2 per cent, showing an increase in what might be called the "work of Americanizing the American Navy."

Now, another thing I desire to state, also in reference to the personnel of the Navy, and that is that our target practice to-day is better than it has ever been since we started in to build up the new Navy. There are more hits, there is better marksmanship, and higher records have been made, records which I think will not only compare favorably with the records made in foreign navies, but, I think, if I were to divulge the confidential character of the reports, they would even be better than that of any navy in the world.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the first paragraph of this bill relates to the pay of men in the Navy. It makes an appropriation of $27,000,000 for that purpose. And I desire to say a word about the pay of officers and men in the Navy. Until the personnel bill was passed, on March 3, 1899, the pay of officers in the Navy was less than the pay of officers in the Army.

But that bill provided that the pay of officers from then on on the active list of the Navy should be much the same as that of officers of corresponding rank in the Army. In that personnel act, however, a provision was made that the Army pay should be cut 15 per cent to officers when on shore duty. That, however, was rectified by the act of Congress of June 29, 1906, when this 15 per cent which had been lopped off the pay of officers serving on shore was restored, and the officers of the Army and Navy were paid the same on shore as on sea. Now, so much for the pay of officers in the Navy.

In regard to the pay of the men, I would state that the pay of the enlisted force in the Navy, with the exception of two or three corps—that of the paymasters' clerks and the mates and warrant officers—is fixed by the President of the United States. A law was passed as far back as 1814, which is known as section 1569 of the Revised Statutes, and provides as follows:

> The pay to be allowed to petty officers, excepting mates, and the pay and bounty upon enlistment of seamen, ordinary seamen, firemen, and coal heavers in the naval service shall be fixed by the President: *Provided*, That the whole sum to be given for the whole pay aforesaid and for the pay of officers and for the said bounties upon enlistment shall not exceed for any one year the amount which may in such year be appropriated for such purposes.

The pay for the men in the Navy, including the petty officers, with the exception of the few classes which I have enumerated, is fixed, then, by the President of the United States, subject to the limitation of the appropriations by Congress.

Now, in all the years since authority has been given to the President of the United States to fix the pay of the men in the Navy, I may say that no Executive has ever abused that authority or discretion. While the Army appropriation bill was under consideration, it was stated, I think, by some gentleman upon the floor that the pay of the men in the Navy had been recently increased. I want to state that I do not find that to be the fact. There has been no general increase in the pay of the men in the Navy since 1884. That was under the Administration of President Arthur. When a man enters or enlists in the Navy, he goes in first as a landsman, at $16 a month. Then later he becomes an ordinary seaman, at $19 a month, whereas in the Army he enlists at the present time at $13 a month. But I think it is hardly a fair proposition to make a comparison between the Army and the Navy. The Army is upon the land; the Navy is upon the sea. The life of a sailor is more laborious than that of a soldier. He is away from home; he has to suffer more discomfort than the soldier. But if we wish to make a comparison of the pay between the Army and the Navy, we can compare, perhaps, more profitably the pay in the Navy with the pay to the seamen in some of our little navies, the infant navies of the Republic, which are connected with some of the different Departments. For instance, we have in connection with the War Department a navy called the "transport service." Now, it may seem strange, perhaps, to you, if you have not looked up the question; but we have a navy in connection with the transport service of the War Department which is greater in tonnage than we had in commission at the opening of the civil war. I refer simply to the vessels that were in commission at the time of the outbreak of the civil war. When the civil war broke out, we had forty-two vessels in commission, and they had a total tonnage of 45,847 tons. In the Army transport service to-day we have a tonnage of 68,404 tons—a larger navy in the Army transport service than we had in commission at the outbreak of the civil war, and some of the vessels in the Army transport service have a larger tonnage than the vessels that were in the civil war. Now, compare the pay of the men in the Navy with the pay of the seamen in the Army transport service—that would be a fair comparison—and if we do that we would find that the seamen in the Army transport service are paid much more than the men in the Navy. Not only that, but if we wanted to make a still further comparison in regard to some of these little navies of the Republic, we could take the Light-House Service, and the Light-House Service to-day has in it forty-six vessels and a tonnage of over 18,000 tons of ships—and I am speaking simply of the tender service of the Light-House Service, not the stationary ships.

Then we might go still further and inquire as to the Revenue-Cutter Service. We have forty-one vessels in that navy, which has a tonnage of over 19,000 tons and 1,288 seamen. Also we have a little navy in connection with the United States Coast Survey. Also we have other navies connected with the Public Health and the Marine-Hospital Service, with the Engineer Department of the Army, with the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with the Bureau of Fisheries, and also the Bureaus of Navigation and Naturalization. We have outside of the Regular Navy of the country all these little infant navies, and if we were to make a comparison between the pay of the men in the Regular Navy and the pay of the men in these little navies, you would find that the pay of the men in the Regular Navy is very much less indeed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to pass on, having spoken upon the subject of the pay of the Navy, but before doing so I desire to give notice here that when this paragraph is reached in the bill I shall offer an amendment to make the pay of the officers the same as that of the officers of corresponding grade in the Army.

When the Army appropriation bill was before the House, you will recall that an amendment was put on it increasing the pay of the enlisted force in the Army. When it went to the Senate it was reported, and has already passed the Senate with an amendment increasing the pay of the officers in the Army 25 per cent in the lower grades and down to 5 per cent in the higher grades. In view of this fact, that it is quite likely that some provision of law will be passed at this session in the Army bill increasing the pay of the officers of the Army, I desire to state that I shall offer at the appropriate time a provision increasing the pay of the officers in the Navy.

The provision I shall offer has already been reported to this House by unanimous report from the Naval Committee, and will be found in House bill 17527, which provides:

> A bill (17527) to equalize and fix the pay of the Navy and the Marine Corps, and for other purposes.
>
> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That hereafter the pay and allowances, except forage and mileage, which shall be governed by existing law, of all officers of the Navy and the Marine Corps shall be the same as the pay and allowances of officers of corresponding rank in the Army.
>
> SEC. 2. That the pay of midshipmen, warrant officers, mates, and paymasters' clerks is hereby increased 25 per cent: *Provided*, That the pay and allowances of midshipmen after graduation at the Naval Academy shall be the same as that provided for second lieutenants of the Army, not mounted.
>
> SEC. 3. That the pay of all commissioned, warrant, and appointed officers, and enlisted men of the Navy and the Marine Corps on the retired list shall hereafter be based on the pay, as herein provided for, of commissioned, warrant, and appointed officers, and enlisted men of corresponding rank and service on the active lists.
>
> SEC. 4. That nothing herein contained shall be construed so as to reduce the pay or allowances now authorized by law for any commissioned, warrant, or appointed officer or any enlisted man on either the active or retired list of the Navy or Marine Corps, and that all laws or parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Everyone recognizes that the two services should be treated alike. So I give notice of my intention in this respect to submit this bill as an amendment upon the naval appropriation bill at the end of the first paragraph in the bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak with reference to the material of the Navy, and I would like the attention of the committee at this time. In my report will be found a statement showing the number of ships already built for the Navy, and also a statement showing the number of ships now in process of construction for the Navy. When all of these vessels are built we will have twenty-nine battle ships, twelve armored cruisers, forty-four cruisers, twenty-one destroyers, thirty-two torpedo boats, and twenty submarines. Our Navy will rank third among the navies of the world.

The statement has appeared in the public press that we rank second. It happens at this time, taking into consideration only the ships already built, that we are ahead of France, but it is not an accurate statement of the situation. Taking into consideration the ships already built and those building we will rank third among the navies of the world.

Now, we have provided in this bill, under the head of "Increase of the Navy," an appropriation of $23,963,915 for ships already authorized and in process of construction. In order to complete these ships it will be necessary to authorize some more appropriations, not this year, but next. To complete these ships fully it will be necessary to appropriate next year the sum of $9,313,974. That will complete the ships which have already been authorized.

The committee this year have authorized some new construction. The Secretary of the Navy appeared before the committee and recommended a naval programme of four new battle ships, four scout cruisers, ten destroyers, four submarines, one ammunition ship, one repair ship, two mine-laying ships, four fleet colliers—a programme amounting to $69,000,000.

The General Board of the Navy Department recommended practically the same programme, but the Committee on Naval Affairs, after a careful consideration of the subject, recognizing that there are other Departments of the Government which necessarily must receive appropriations this year, and taking into consideration also the condition of our revenues and our expenditures, came to the conclusion that the recommendation of two battle ships, duplicates of ships which have already been authorized under the appropriation act of last year, would meet with the fair sense and judgment of this House.

And so in this bill we have recommended the building of these two battle ships of 20,000 tons each. They will cost in the neighborhood of $10,000,000 each. In addition to that we have recommended the construction of ten torpedo-boat destroyers, each to cost about $800,000, and eight submarines—a naval programme which will cost in the neighborhood of $30,000,000, a little less than one-half of that which is recommended by the Secretary of the Navy and the General Board.

Mr. Chairman, I desire now to speak a little upon the cost of our Navy. This is a great year in the history of the new Navy. It was twenty-five years ago that we started in to build up the new Navy under the Administration of President Arthur. March 3, 1883, was the birthday of the new Navy. That year, at that time, we authorized the *Atlanta*, the *Boston*, the *Chicago*, and the *Dolphin*, sometimes called the A, B, C, and D of the new Navy. Since that time we have been going on, year after year, building cruisers, battle ships, and destroyers, until to-day we have a good Navy. Now, it may interest some of the Members of this House to know how much this Navy has cost, how much we have expended in the construction of these ships. The cost of all these battle ships which we have authorized amounts to $309,000,000. We have appropriated for the Navy during the last twenty-five years $1,244,657,000. Of this, as I say, $309,000,000 have gone into the construction of the new ships, leaving a balance of $935,000,000, which have gone to the maintenance of the naval establishment during the last twenty-five years. This has been an average per year of $37,000,000 for maintenance. This is what the new Navy has cost us.

March 3, as I said, 1883, was the birthday of the new Navy. We started in then to build our first new ships, which were cruisers, but it was not until 1890 that we authorized the first battle ship, which was the *Indiana*. That battle ship had a tonnage of 10,288 tons. Its freeboard was about 11 feet and 6 inches. It has armor plate upon its sides 18 inches thick. Its speed was less than 16 knots. That was the first battle ship that Congress authorized, and it cost in the neighborhood of about $6,000,000.

To-day we are building greater battle ships—two of them, the *Delaware* and the *North Dakota*. They have each a tonnage of 20,000 tons. The armor plate upon their sides is only 9 inches thick, but better armor, and their freeboards are much higher—twice as high as those of the *Indiana*—all of which goes to show that during the last eighteen years there has been a mighty and tremendous development in the construction of the American battle ship. The guns upon the *Indiana* were built to fire only once every five minutes, but upon the new battle ships the large guns, the 12-inch guns, will each fire twice every minute if necessary. In fact, there is hardly anything which the hand of man has contrived during the last twenty-five years which has undergone such a tremendous revolution and change as the great battle ship, the instrument of warfare, the instrument of the nation's defense. If you look at the character of our battle ships first authorized by Congress and as we authorize them to-day, you will be struck by the fact that they illustrate the policy of Congress. The *Indiana* has a low freeboard of about 11 feet and 6 inches. What was the idea of the Navy back at the time when the *Indiana* was built? Then we were building up this Navy, but not with the idea of an aggressive navy. It was a navy for defense, and up to the time of the Spanish-American war—yes, up to the time of the naval appropriation bill of 1900—every authorization for an American battle ship carried these words, "coast-line battle ship." The policy of Congress had been, up to 1900, to build up what? A navy for defense, a navy to hug the shore line, a navy to defend the coast line. But the Spanish-American war came on and it opened up a larger door of greater opportunity to this country. Then the policy of the American Navy and of Congress changed. What has it been from that time on? To build up a navy for defense; yes, but in recognition of another principle, that the best defense is the ability to make an aggressive offense; and so, from 1900, in every appropriation bill authorizing the building of an American battle ship you will find those words "coast line" stricken out, and the authorization reads, "a seagoing battle ship"—a battle ship capable of fighting the enemy out on the high seas and not simply defending the coast line. So we have been building up this Navy upon that theory since 1900—a navy for defense; yes, and a navy for offense if necessary.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman a question for information.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That line that was put into the preceding bills about coast-line defense was a fiction, was it not?

Mr. FOSS. No; there has been a change in the policy, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Any of those ships can be sent around the world?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; they can be.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then it was all a fiction, was it not?

Mr. FOSS. No; not necessarily a fiction, but they were built with reference to the policy of a defensive navy, to guard and protect our coast line.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is there any difference between one that is fixed up for coast-line defense and one that is fixed up for deep-sea fighting?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; I think there is quite a difference. The old *Monitor*, I will say to my friend, the ships that were built at the close of the war and the ships following that were all of the *Monitor* type, like the *Monadnock* or the *Miantonomoh*—they were ships where the freeboard was only a few feet above the water line.

But gradually, as the policy of the Navy has developed, we have given our ships a higher freeboard, we have given them greater speed, recognizing the principle that we were building up a navy that would be able to hold its own out on the high seas as well as along our harbors and coast line.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there have been a great many criticisms which have been made during the last few months about the construction of our ships—criticisms made by people who did not know very much about naval construction and criticisms made by men who ought to know something about it—and I want to say to you that the Committee on Naval Affairs have had important hearings upon this subject of ship construction, and the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs have also had extensive and exhaustive hearings, and I think that everyone who has read those hearings has come to the conclusion that our ships have been honestly and properly constructed during these years and that they will compare favorably with ships constructed by foreign nations during the same period.

There is no man to-day in the American Navy who is so generally regarded as a man of authority, a man of intelligence, a man of ability, and a man of fairness, as Admiral Converse. I should say that he is to-day probably our greatest living naval authority. He has been chief of three of the important bureaus of the Navy Department, the Bureau of Equipment, the Bureau of Ordnance, and the Bureau of Navigation. He has gone through all of this whole matter of press criticism and magazine criticism with reference to the construction of our ships and made a report in which he brushes away these criticisms, which were largely misstatements of facts, as one would brush away the cobwebs and the dust out of a room; and the report which he makes to the Secretary of the Navy in regard to the construction of our ships is that they are not inferior to those in foreign services. He says:

> We have made compromises in our designs of battle ships, because it is impossible to construct a perfect battle ship; such compromises have, perhaps, detracted from the desired perfect ship in some respects, but at the same time have made it possible to improve upon some other existing disadvantages, and, on the whole, the compromises, each and all, have tended toward a nearer approach to the desired perfect finality.
>
> Other nations have labored and will, like ourselves, continue to labor under this same difficulty in endeavoring to approach as near as possible to that impossibility—a perfect battle ship. In making compromises in the building of our ships, I am satisfied that in every instance all concerned in the work have acted honestly and patriotically, and only with the desire to produce the best ship possible. The result has been in each case, ship by ship and year by year, an improvement upon all that have preceded, and no ship has been built by us inferior to those of any nation designed at the same time.
>
> The quality of the matériel of our Navy is inferior to none; in quantity of vessels alone are we lacking. With an increase in number of ships the American Navy will have been supplied the only feature necessary to make it second to none in all that tends toward fighting efficiency, and when the stress of actual combat, if such should ever unfortunately come, brings the only really practical test, our country

need have no misgivings or fear but that our battle ships will give an excellent account of themselves and prove themselves all that we have designed them for and know them to be.

That is the final expression of Admiral Converse at the end of an exhaustive report upon these criticisms that have appeared in the public press and in public magazines.

In addition to that I might also read you the testimony of the Chief Constructor of the Navy, Admiral Capps, and I want to say to you that in my judgment there has been no man who has been Chief Constructor of the Navy who was abler than the present Chief Constructor. He ranks the equal of any in the world. He has constructed our ships now for the last four or five years, and he has produced ships which have been commented on favorably by the naval authorities of the leading foreign navies.

In a publication which is produced every year of fighting ships called, "Jane's Fighting Ships," an English publication, I read this:

> The extraordinary high figures for United States ships afford food for considerable thought, for both in ships with high-powered guns, or impervious to vital injury at long range, the United States fleet is superior to any other navy in the world. Even by the inclusion of 40-caliber 12-inch types, extinct so far as new ships are concerned, the United States Navy is an extremely good second, and the corresponding lead in invulnerability outside of 7,000 yards is considerably increased.

Again in this publication, after a word on the new designs of the *South Carolina* and *Oregon*, the following positive statement is made:

> There is good reason to believe that, taking all things into consideration, the *South Carolina* type is the best all-big-gun ship yet put in hand.

This is the expression of others. Now, we will have finished in a few years the *South Carolina* type, and we have gone on building the *Delaware* and *North Dakota*, which are better still. I could read you to-day the expressions of naval authorities, of naval architects in other navies of the world, all commendatory of the ships we have been building during these years in which we have been constructing the American Navy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a few months ago when the President of the United States gave the order that sent the fleet through the Strait of Magellan out into the Pacific we heard a great deal of criticism from the public press, particularly in the vicinity of New York. The fleet has passed through the Strait of Magellan out into the Pacific and we hear no criticism now. A fleet of sixteen battle ships, aggregating 223,000 tons, commanded and officered by 14,000 men, the greatest fleet of recent years, which could be duplicated only by England herself, has passed safely from the Atlantic around into the Pacific. We had criticism a few months ago; we have none now because everybody recognizes that it was a good order which the President made. What use is it to build up ships unless we have them in fleet formation? What use is it to build up a navy unless we send that navy out on long cruises where the men can be properly disciplined and trained? What do you think Rojestvensky would have given if he could have made the cruise from Cronstandt to Tsushima in time of peace before he was compelled to do so in time of war? Do you not think his fleet would have been in better condition to meet the enemy in the Sea of Japan if he had made the cruise at least once before in time of peace? This cruise of the American fleet through the Strait of Magellan has been very profitable to the American Navy, because it has disciplined and trained our personnel and our officers. They have been able to find out the weaknesses in our personnel, if any exist, and not only that but it has been of great benefit also to the matériel of the American Navy. They have learned whether our ships were good for anything or not, and the word just coming back to us from Magdalena Bay has been that our ships were even better than when they started on the cruise and the personnel more highly trained and better disciplined than when they first set sail from Hampton Roads.

Another thing which this cruise has called to the attention of the American people is that the American Navy is a national institution; that we are building up a navy for the protection of the Pacific as well as the Atlantic; that we are a two-oceans country; and necessarily, if the American Navy is to be the instrument of our national defense, we must have a two-oceans navy—a fleet upon the Pacific as well as a fleet upon the Atlantic. [Applause.]

This cruise of the Navy into the Pacific has called the attention of the country to another important thing. Wherever that fleet has gone it has been met in every port with the hospitality and the cordiality for which the people of the South American countries are famous. It has tended to cement in closer bonds the relations between our country and the South American Republics. It has given force and efficacy to the words of our able Secretary of State, who made a visit to the leading Republics of South America a few months ago, and it has bound those Republics to us by closer ties than any single thing which could have happened.

The people of South America recognize that we are bound together in one common destiny, and that the American Navy and the American people propose to maintain and uphold the Monroe doctrine and have the ability to do so. Not only has the cruise been beneficial in that respect, but, Mr. Chairman, it has called the attention of the country also to the fact that we are moving westward in our national development. All our history has been along the shores of the Atlantic, all our wars have been along the shores of the Atlantic. Our war for national independence and our war for the freedom of the seas have been largely along the shores of the Atlantic. But we are passing now in our national development from the Atlantic westward to the Pacific. We are beginning to realize what William H. Seward said on the floor of the American Senate fifty years ago, that the Pacific Ocean, its islands and its shores and the great region beyond, would some day be the chief theater of events in the world's great hereafter.

Now, this passing of the fleet from the Atlantic to the Pacific has called to the attention of every American citizen the onward growth of American thought and American development. And let me say to you that no country to-day stands higher in its influence and power in the Pacific than our own nation, and it has come by a long and logical course of events. It was in 1852 that Perry sailed with his little fleet into the Bay of Yeddo and knocked at the gates of old Japan—that Japan which had been closed for hundreds of years to foreign treaty, to foreign commerce, or to foreign intercourse. But Perry lay there knocking, knocking, knocking at the gates of old Japan until finally the gates flew open. Flew open to what? Flew open to commerce, flew open to treaty, flew open to the new and rising nation of Japan. It was an American fleet which opened the door. And a few years ago, when I had the pleasure of visiting Tokyo and was a guest in the Taft party of the secretary of state, the Japanese secretary of state on that occasion alluded to that visit of Commodore Perry more than fifty years ago, and said that was the beginning of the development of the new and modern Japan.

It was only about ten years ago that the United States acquired the Hawaiian Islands, the key of the Pacific, and here the other day this House passed a bill establishing a naval station at Pearl Harbor in recognition of the fact that the Hawaiian Islands are the great key of strategy of the whole Pacific Ocean.

And so, I say, our influence in the development in the Pacific has been moving on. The next stepping-stone in the American development in the Pacific was when the fleet of Dewey left Hongkong and sailed into the Bay of Manila on that bright May morning and destroyed Spanish sovereignty in those islands. The next stepping-stone in the development of American influence was when the Congress of the United States established a government over the Philippine Islands under an American flag, a flag that never waved over any people but to bless and to save. The next stepping-stone in the development of American influence in the Pacific was the splendid and matchless diplomacy of John Hay, late Secretary of State, in insisting upon the preservation of the integrity of China and opening up the ports to the commerce of the world. The next stepping-stone in the development of American influence in the Pacific was when the Congress of the United States authorized the building of the great Panama Canal, which will bring these two great oceans, the Atlantic and the Pacific, into everlasting fellowship. The last stepping-stone in the development of American influence was when the President of the United States invited the representatives of Russia and Japan, who were then engaged in war, to come to our own shores and here, in a Government navy-yard, settle their dispute. And it was so successful that the name and influence of the American nation is greater to-day all over the Pacific than that of any other country in the world. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed one hour. Of course the gentleman is entitled to consume more time, but it is customary to call attention to the fact at the end of one hour.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentlemen upon the other side to go ahead.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, in my absence my colleague on the committee [Mr. PADGETT] has had the responsibility of listening to the appeals of Members for time, and I think he should have the disposition of it under the circumstances. I therefore yield to him to control the time, which, I believe, under the rule under which we are operating, was placed with me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] is recognized to control the time on behalf of the minority.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will ask that the Chair notify me at the expiration of forty minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Naval Affairs has submitted a bill making appropriations for the support of the Navy for the fiscal year 1909. The committee has given to the consideration of the bill wise, deliberate, careful, and painstaking care and investigation. I come to the discussion of the measure not in a partisan spirit, not as a Democrat, not as a representative of the minority, but as an American citizen. I do not believe that there is any more politics in a battle ship than there is in a sweet potato. I come to discuss the question as a friend of the Navy. I believe it was General Scott whose Whiggery was questioned, and his reply was: "I am a Whig, but I am not a damn-fool Whig." I am, if I may be permitted to paraphrase the expression, a friend of the Navy. [Applause.]

The Committee on Naval Affairs submits this bill to the judgment and to the scrutiny and the careful and painstaking investigation of the House and of the country, and it invites scrutiny and criticism. We believe that our action has been conservative. We believe that we have acted prudently, and at the same time we believe that we have been liberal to the Department. I may say that if there is any criticism which might be leveled at the action of the committee, it is that we have erred on the side of liberality rather than on the side of parsimony.

There has been criticism of the action of the committee. Many of the press of the country have criticised its action, because the committee declined to report four immense battle ships. It has been said that the committee was niggardly and parsimonious. I stand by the action of the committee, and say that we have been liberal. It is said that the United States is rich, and that we ought to spend the money. I desire to call attention to the fact that the only source of revenue the United States has is the taxing power of the Government, and that all the money in the Treasury is tax money. It is not the province, nor is it the duty, of Congress to arrogate to itself the assumption that the United States is rich, and therefore Congress may be extravagant. It is our duty to remember and to legislate along the line of the theory and the policy that every dollar in the Treasury is tax money, levied upon the toil, the labor, the industry, and the production of the American people, and that the Congress is charged with the duty of a wise, a just, and a conservative expenditure of that money. [Applause.]

It is said that we should build ships in order to spend the money in the Treasury, to give employment to labor, to build up industry, and to put money in circulation. I can not subscribe to or indorse that political theory or doctrine. That is an advanced step in the doctrine of paternalism which I do not believe the Congress of the United States is even to-day prepared to take; and I am glad to know that it has never yet been adopted as a policy of the Government, that it shall exercise the taxing power of the Government and lay a tax upon the many in order to distribute it in the employment of the few or the select.

In reply to the criticism that has been made of the committee for its refusal to sanction such a principle and such a policy, I wish to say the committee has repudiated any such principle and policy of government upon which to predicate its report and pass this bill, which it submits to your intelligent consideration.

I desire to call your attention to the fact that ship advocacy—the advocacy of the building of ships—has become an industry in this country. Every year at a certain season much of the press is filled daily and weekly advocating extravagance in the building of ships. It has become an industry. It is not hard to trace the origin or the motive. When we consider that the expenditure each year of $20,000,000 or rather, as claimed by some, $40,000,000 in one year, there is a strong inducement upon the part of some to manufacture public sentiment to go behind the committee and the country to urge us beyond safe and conservative action, and I stand here in defense of the committee to say that your committee, in the consideration of this matter, have not been influenced by the hue and cry that is the product of the advocacy of ship construction, which has become an industry in this country.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him? I heartily agree with what the gentleman has said. Will the gentleman inform us why his committee, pursuing a conservative policy, recommends the construction of two battle ships in place of four, as recommended by the Department, and at the same time recommends the construction of twice the number of submarine torpedo boats recommended by the Department?

Mr. PADGETT. If the gentleman will permit me, I will not take very much time on that. In the first place, eight submarines would cost about two and a half millions of dollars, all told. The Department recommended four and the committee has recommended eight, so that the increase, in round numbers, is one and a quarter million dollars, whereas one single battle ship would cost $10,000,000. In the next place, the President of the United States in his messages heretofore has called attention to the woeful deficiency in and lack of submarines; the Secretary of the Navy has in his report of last year called attention to and emphasized the necessity for more submarines; and, in the next place, our seacoast line requires that we should have some along our coast. But in order that I may explain my position to the gentleman, I will say that personally, for reasons that appear sufficient to me, I voted against the whole submarine proposition in committee; but I did it not because I was opposed to submarines, not because there was anything wrong, because, I say frankly, that I would have voted for the eight submarines had there not been limitations placed upon the purchase. England has thirty-nine, France has forty-one, Russia has twenty-five, and the United States has twelve. England has twenty-one building, France is building sixty-three, and the United States is building seven. So the action of the committee in recommending eight was not extravagant or unreasonable in the light of the above facts.

I want to be entirely frank, and I will say that while I voted against it because I thought the policy of the limitations was improper, I would have voted for the eight had those limitations not been upon the purchase.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. The gentleman understands that I am not criticising him at all.

Mr. PADGETT. I understand.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. But do I understand the gentleman to say that the President now recommends eight of these boats?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not. I said that the President had called attention in his former messages to our deficiency and lack of these matters.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. But at this time he has approved of the Department's estimates of four.

Mr. PADGETT. He does not say anything, as I remember, especially on the subject, except speaking in general terms of the need of these things; but he does not say four, or eight, or any other number.

Now, if I may return to the discussion of this question, I want to call attention to another matter, and that is the exciting of public apprehension. We all remember a year or two ago the racket was worked on Germany, and every fall at the meeting of Congress we were told of the threatening and appalling danger of disaster and conflict with Germany. It was worked and reworked and worked over and over again until it became as frazzled as a last year's whip cracker, and then that was abandoned and they substituted in lieu of it poor old Japan in the Orient. Now, they are working and trying to excite the fears and the apprehensions of the American people over our relations with the Japanese Empire, the same old scheme that was worked with Germany, and they will work it until it becomes frazzled, and then switch off to something else. The committee has withstood this, and submits its action, based upon sound and fundamental reasons.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman excuse me? I have only about forty minutes, and I have consumed nearly twenty minutes of that time. I can not submit to interruption.

I want to speak of the United States. One hundred and twenty-five years we have existed. We began as a Government in a wilderness, and through that one hundred and twenty-five years we have marched on the upward line of progress and developed a civilization, and to-day our ninety millions of people, with their civilization, their production, and their resources, are a nation of power. We have lived these one hundred and twenty-five years; we have escaped all the pitfalls and the snares and the dangers. In our infancy we were not ensnared. In our boyhood we were not engulfed. In our young manhood we were not beaten; but now they come and raise the cry that because we have gotten to be a great and a strong and a mighty and a powerful nation, the greatest and the grandest and the noblest and the most powerful in all the world's history and civilization, therefore we are in danger. I do not subscribe to it and I do not believe it. [Applause.] Who is going to strike us? No nation on the face of the earth is going, voluntarily, to strike the Government of the United States. The very power of our Government, the intelligence of its citizenship, the magnitude of its resources, its manhood, and its civilization stand as a guaranty and the assurance of its protection. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, we have reached the time of decision. This is the crisis in the history of the American Congress. The issue is presented to this Congress and must be met and met frankly and met completely and met positively. We have come to the parting of the ways. Heretofore, during the one hundred and twenty-five years of our existence, our growth, and our development, we have pursued the lines of peace. We have followed the path and the policy of progress and the development and the upbuilding of the resources and the wealth and the civilization of our country; but now we are confronted with the direct proposition that we must depart from that; we must depart from the traditions; we must forget the history of the past; we must embark upon a new policy and a new programme, and we must go into a wild and an extravagant naval programme that would dazzle the nations of the earth, and would levy tribute to exhaustion upon the resources and the labor and the production of American citizenship. I stand here to protest against it.

As I said, here is a plain issue. The President recommends four battle ships. The committee has not followed that recommendation. The committee has only submitted two, and I have said that in doing that we have been liberal.

Now, let me for a moment, if you please, present the issue. I read from the minority report by the distinguished member of the committee, Captain HOBSON, filed as a part of the record.

Says he in the minority report:

The only rational basis for a proper national defense is for us to proceed to guarantee control of the sea against any nation of Asia in the Pacific and against any nation of Europe in the Atlantic, both at the same time; whether we realize it or not, this policy is inevitable. We may have to learn our lesson in the school of suffering, amidst humiliation and defeat, but we will yet learn the lesson that, for the elemental purposes of self-preservation in fulfilling the very first duty that we owe to ourselves, America must be supreme on the ocean. There is no escape. We must, as long as present conditions hold, prepare to create and maintain a navy equal to the combined navies of Great Britain and Japan.

That presents to the American people a question that they must meet and determine in this Congress; for if the committee is overridden and if this Congress authorizes four battle ships this session there will be no end to the question in the years to come.

But let us see whether that is needed or not. In 1905 the Secretary of the Navy made his report, and he says:

The aggregate of our battle ships, armored cruisers, coast-defense vessels built, building, and authorized would seem, according to present indications, sufficient to provide for any contingencies within the limit of probabilities.

That was the statement of the Secretary of the Navy in 1905. The President of the United States in 1905 followed it up in his annual message, in which he says:

We have most wisely continued for a number of years to build up our Navy, and it has now reached a fairly high standard of efficiency. This standard of efficiency must not only be maintained, but increased. It does not seem to me necessary, however, that the Navy should, at least in the immediate future, be increased beyond the present number of units. What is now clearly necessary is to substitute efficient for inefficient units as the latter become worn out or as it becomes apparent that they are useless. Probably the result would be attained by adding a single battle ship to our Navy each year, the superseded or worn-out vessels being laid up or broken up as they are being replaced.

The President stated that one battle ship a year would be sufficient. But that is not all. He followed up that message in 1906 with a similar message reaffirming his statement. He says:

I do not ask that we continue to increase our Navy. I ask merely that it be maintained at its present strength, and this can be done only if we replace the obsolete and out-worn ships by new and good ones the equal of any afloat in any navy.

And then, speaking of the worn-out, antiquated, double-turret monitors, he says:

All these ships should be replaced by others. This can be done by the well-settled programme of providing for the building each year of at least one first-class battle ship equal in size and speed to any that any nation is at the same time building. The armament presumably consists of as large a number as possible of very heavy guns of one caliber, together with smaller guns to repel torpedo attack.

Now, that policy all at once is sought to be overturned, and the enormous programme thrown upon Congress of four battle ships, to cost $40,000,000, in one year.

Let me call your attention to another matter, if you please. What is the condition of our Navy? I say that we have a magnificent navy. I hold here the official sheet issued by the Office of Naval Intelligence, of the date of November 1, giving the naval strength of the powers—Great Britain, France, the United States, Germany, Japan, and other nations. At the present time the United States stands second, England stands first, France stands third, Germany fourth, and Japan fifth. But if the programme now building is completed England will be first, France second, the United States third, Germany fourth, and Japan fifth.

But let me call attention to the tonnage. The United States has built and is building 771,758 tons; Japan, 451,320 tons, or the United States has an excess of 320,000 tons.

At the date of this statement—four or five have been completed since—the United States had twenty-two battle ships built and Japan eleven. The United States had seven building and Japan two.

But I want to call attention to another matter, for I must hurry on. The Secretary of the Navy, when he was before the committee, was asked with reference to the officers. He stated that with the present complement of ships on a peace basis we were 1,686 officers short, and on a war basis, in order to officer the present complement of ships built and building, we were 1,846 officers short. He stated further that Annapolis was graduating each year from 180 to 200, and that we were losing each year by death and retirement about forty, so that we are gaining about 150 officers a year—so that, on a peace basis, with the present complement of ships, it would take us eleven years to get officers enough to officer the ships that we now have, not including the two that we have authorized in this bill and those that we may authorize in the years to come.

Now, I ask you what is the common sense, what is the common justice and honesty, if you please, of going on building ships ahead of the officers when we have no officers to officer them? It takes as long to train an officer as it does to build a ship. It takes longer, if you please, to train and educate an officer competent to manage a ship than it takes to build your ship. We are 1,686 officers short to-day, and it would take eleven years to catch up. What is the necessity of this great haste? But I can answer that question, if you please, by the President's own message, for the President has spoken upon that question. Hear what the President says in his message of 1905:

No fighting ship of the first class should ever be laid up, save for necessary repairs, and her crew should be kept constantly exercised on the high seas, so that she may stand at the highest point of perfection. To put a new and untrained crew upon the most powerful battle ship and send it out to meet a formidable enemy is not only to invite, but to insure disaster and disgrace. To improvise crews at the outbreak of a war, so far as the serious fighting craft are concerned, is absolutely hopeless. If the officers and men are not thoroughly skilled in and have not been thoroughly trained to their duties, it would be far better to keep the ships in port during hostilities than to send them against a formidable opponent, for the result could only be that they would be either sunk or captured.

In 1906 he reaffirms and reasserts that statement. But that is not all. Admiral Winslow was before our committee. He is the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation. He was asked to state what was the shortage in enlisted men, and he stated that upon the present complement of ships now built and building we were 22,701 men short. To meet that in this very bill your committee has authorized an additional enlistment of 6,000 men at an additional annual cost of at least $3,216,000. And that would still leave us 16,701 men short—not counting the two ships that we authorize in this bill. With this condition of affairs, I appeal to you as sensible, thinking, patriotic citizens, who are to dispose of the trust money of the taxpayers of the American people, what is the wisdom or the righteousness of this pellmell rushing into the construction of ships, when we have neither the officers nor the men to man them? [Applause.]

I put that question to the Secretary of the Navy. I asked him:

Mr. Secretary, does not the large shortage of officers which you mention argue that we might hold up building battle ships for a while?

Secretary METCALF. I don't think so, because we need the battle ships. We can put some of the big cruisers in reserve and take the officers and men from those cruisers and put them on the battle ships.

Doubtless he had overlooked what the President had said would almost be treason, to tie up our fighting ships, to put improvised crews upon them if it became necessary to use them.

But I want to call attention very hastily to what we have done and what we are doing. I want to call attention to what the present committee at the present Congress has done. The present bill carries in round numbers—and I will use round numbers and not give the odd dollars and cents—$103,967,000. We have already passed two deficiency bills, $3,611,000. We have authorized in the Pearl Harbor bill an appropriation of $650,000. We have reported a bill for two steel dry docks, $3,500,000. We have reported a bill authorizing the purchase of three steam colliers, $1,575,000. We have reported a bill for the increase of the Marine Corps 1,500 men and officers at an increased annual expenditure of $957,168—amounting in the aggregate to $114,261,000.

But that is not all. In addition to that we have authorized two battle ships of $19,000,000, ten torpedo boats at $8,000,000, eight submarine boats at $3,500,000, three subsurface boats at $445,000, Pearl Harbor project authorized to be contracted for,

$2,050,000, and the estimates to complete the dredging of the channel of the river as stipulated in that bill, though not limited, estimated at $2,500,000, making $35,495,000 additional; or, if you please, a total of $149,756,476—that is at this Congress—not counting the multitude of little bills of several thousand dollars each that I have not taken the pains nor the time to tabulate. In addition, Admiral Capps states that in the fiscal years 1910 and 1911 on existing contracts we will have to appropriate for armor and armament for increase of the Navy, $36,610,048.

Let me call your attention to another matter. In 1883, for the first time, the naval appropriation reached approximately $15,000,000; in 1888 it reached, for the first time, $26,000,000; in 1892 it reached, for the first time, $31,000,000, and in 1897 it was $31,000,000. In 1900, for the first time, the annual appropriation bill reached $53,000,000. Since 1905 it has not been less than one hundred millions, and now, as I have shown you, this Congress is providing appropriations and authorizations for $150,000,000. Is it not time that we were stopping to think and to consider and to reflect? The American people are not mad on this subject. They expect wise and conservative action of this Congress. [Applause.]

It is said that we did not follow the recommendations of the Department. What did the Department submit? They submitted regular estimates of $128,846,000, and they submitted estimates for increase of the Navy of $69,370,000, making what they asked for in estimates $198,116,000, leaving out the Pearl Harbor projects and these other matters that have been mentioned, which I will not take time to reiterate.

Was not the committee to exercise some judgment and put in the pruning knife somewhere? But let me direct your attention again: The total estimates submitted for the Government, exclusive of the estimates for the Post-Office Department, amounted to $766,508,000. The estimates for the Post-Office Department amounted to $230,000,000, making in round numbers a billion of dollars of estimates submitted. The appropriations last year were $929,000,000. This year we are going to reach the billion-dollar mark in one Congress. This very morning the deficiency of revenue was $39,460,763 since the first day of last July. It is said we have $250,000,000 in the Treasury. Yes; but we have used $39,000,000 of it to pay current expenses on a deficiency of an average of about $4,500,000 a month.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state, as requested, that the gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. There are some other matters that I should be very glad indeed to refer to, and I will encoach upon five minutes more of the time and take the liberty of doing that. Another matter I want to call attention to is this: Another policy that is outlined in the minority report that is vital and presents a question to be determined by this Congress is in these words:

> Many are opposed to an adequate programme because it is expensive. The truth is, the more expensive the better, for while other nations have gained their advantage by taking men away from work and organizing armies, we have left our men at work and have the advantage of greater resources, so that we can afford the expense of a great navy and they can not. The whole question is a relative one. The more expensive we make naval power, the quicker military nations that contest our rights to supremacy on the sea must drop behind. The more burdensome we make the carrying of great armaments, the quicker the military nations staggering under the loads will be willing to join us in evolving an adequate system of collective protection, which would enable us all to give up these armaments. The true way to hasten the disarmament of the nations is to speedily increase the burden of the armaments.

That is the logic of the minority report. I frankly, freely, and fully confess that I do not subscribe to it. The ethics of that report is this: A father says to his son, "My son, I am opposed to gambling; gambling is wrong; we want to break up gambling, and as there are some fellows in the community who will gamble, you get to be an expert gambler and win all their money and break them and then they can not gamble any longer." [Applause.] I have always heard the lack of money was a good reason for not gambling. Now, then, one other proposition in regard to comparing our Navy with the navy of Japan.

I have made a synopsis here of the fighting ships of the United States and Japan. The United States had 22 battle ships built at the time these figures were made. We have now 26, but at the time we had 22, Japan had 12. The United States had building 7, Japan 3. On these battle ships the United States had 32 13-inch guns, Japan none. The United States had 104 12-inch guns, Japan 88; 10-inch guns, the United States had none, Japan 40; 8-inch guns, the United States had 144, Japan none; 7-inch guns, the United States had 88, Japan none; 6-inch guns, the United States had 160, Japan 85. That is the battle-ship armament. Now take the armored cruisers. The United States had 13 armored cruisers built, Japan 11. The United States had building 2, and Japan 2; Japan had 1 projected. The armament of those ships were, 12-inch guns, Japan 20, the United States none; 10-inch guns, the United States 16, Japan 9; 8-inch guns, United States none, Japan 56; 6-inch guns, the United States 190, Japan 120; 5-inch guns, the United States 22, Japan none; and yet I read further in this minority report this statement:

> These Japanese *Dreadnoughts* carry 4 12-inch and 12 10-inch guns, or 16 great guns each. The best of our ships only carry 4 great guns each. It is conservative to evaluate each of these Japanese *Dreadnoughts* as the equivalent of 4 of our average vessels.

The gentleman forgets to state that the American ships have eight 8-inch guns each. That is not stated in that proposition. He says that one of these Japanese would be equal to four of the American ships. Now, let us suppose a condition where one of these Japanese ships attacked four American ships, the Japanese ship with sixteen guns could use four guns only on each American ship, and in return the four ships of the American Navy would have sixteen 12-inch guns and thirty-two 8-inch guns with which to fight that Japanese ship. Besides, it is hardly fair to compare the latest ships of the Japanese *Dreadnought* class with our old style of ships. The comparison should be made with the American *Dreadnoughts* of the *Delaware* type, having ten 12-inch guns. Moreover, the 8-inch guns are effective and efficient guns and would do good service. The 8-inch guns are not negligible factors on our ships and should not be omitted in estimating their fighting power. Does any man think that would be an equal contest on the part of the Japanese ship?

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I have given the gentleman one hour, which is more time than anybody else, I can not now yield. I have already trespassed now seven minutes on time that I gave to some others, but I felt the importance of this question as a member of the committee and thought I should take a little more time.

The magnitude, the power, the grandeur of the American nation and the American people have been counted for naught. Our resources, in this minority report, have been converted into liabilities, and our strength has been counted simply as weakness. Against these chimerical ghosts and phantasms, erected and imagined, as a boy going through a graveyard whistling to keep up his courage, I place the manhood and the patriotism and the intelligence and the courage, the civilization of the American people; and these vain imaginations can not stand at the bar of the judgment of the sober, thinking people of the American public. [Loud applause.]

Mr. Chairman, our Government has taken an active and prominent part in The Hague conferences and made many professions of its sincere desire for the promotion of peace, international arbitration and in favor of the limitation of armaments. We have declared to the world that the cruise of our fleet to the Pacific and around the world was friendly to all powers and had no element of hostile demonstration or intent. In that we are sincere.

But I ask in all seriousness if we should now, under these circumstances, reverse the policies enunciated by the President in his 1905 and 1906 messages and enter upon this new and fundamentally different policy and authorize the construction of four immense battle ships, could we make our professions square with our acts, and would not other nations have cause at least to suspect the sincerity of our professions?

Mr. Chairman, Congress has other cares and obligations to meet beside the military. I may add that the Army appropriation bill carries $98,000,000, the fortifications bill $12,000,000, and the pension bill carries $151,000,000. These added to the naval budget before mentioned shows the enormous sums of money we are spending by reason of the military and naval establishments of this country. Let me draw a contrast.

For the great Department of Agriculture, which directly touches so many of our people and is doing such a wonderful work for our people, the total appropriation for all the work of this great Department so far proposed for the next year is only the sum of $14,981,346—the cost of one and a half battle ships. Comment is unnecessary. Yet last year the value of farm products exceeded the fabulous sum of $3,000,000,000, sustaining the business and enterprise of the country.

Our rivers and harbors are deserving of and are demanding consideration and improvement. There is the great Lakes-to-the-Gulf project, in which millions of our people and many of the great interior States are vitally interested. There is the great project of the Beaufort Canal and the draining of the Dismal Swamp, in which the Atlantic States are interested. The improvement of the waterways of the great West and of the Pacific slope are worthy of the consideration and help of the Government.

There are the great questions of the preservation of our forests and sources of water supply—for illustration, the White Mountain and Appalachian Forest Reserves. But all of them are denied consideration and help on the ground of lack of money and the cost of the enterprises. All over the country there is a desire for Government buildings for the accommodation of Government work, and yet the same cry—lack of money. But I will not multiply citations. Let us do justice to the Navy. Let every proper consideration be given to its needs, but let us not lose our heads and forget our other duties and obligations.

In a wise, conservative, yet broad and American spirit, let us consider and discharge our whole duty.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether it will be done or not, and I do not ask to violate the rules, but if it is going to be granted to others, I want the right to extend my remarks on this bill in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask that it be extended to all Members who speak on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the committee can not give unanimous consent. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on this subject in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this subject in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on this subject in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FAVROT].

Mr. FAVROT. Mr. Chairman, the limitation of my time on this vitally important question necessitates brevity in my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the arguments urged against the building of four battle ships are, in the main, two. The first is the plea of economy. Mr. Chairman, I believe in economy as much as does any gentleman upon the floor of this House, but not in economy on the nation's defenses or at the expense of the nation's safety or the nation's honor. I stand, Mr. Chairman, for an economical administration of public affairs, but when the safety of the country or the honor and the glory of that flag is at stake I do not believe that the question of expense should for one moment be considered. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the second argument against the increase to four battle ships, as I understand it, is that we need a navy no greater than is necessary to repel invasion. Grant, for the sake of argument, that our present Navy is sufficient for that purpose; we still need a greater navy. We have assumed certain obligations—obligations on both oceans, obligations which we can not repudiate, and from the performance of which we can not shrink with honor. The first, the greatest, and, I may say, the most sacred of those obligations is the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine, and I do not believe that there is a gentleman upon this floor who would advocate the repudiation of that doctrine or who does not believe that it is our duty, at all hazards, to uphold it. [Applause.] This Government can not permit a violation of the Monroe doctrine with safety or with honor and without humiliation. And, mind you, that doctrine is unrecognized by international law, is unrecognized by treaty. Its only force is our ability to enforce it. It is simply a threat, a declaration to Europe that "if you attempt to seize upon any American territory we will by force prevent you;" and unless we are prepared to carry that threat into execution, unless we are prepared to make that threat effective, the Monroe doctrine becomes mere bombast and will be respected as such.

And, Mr. Chairman, with the building of the Panama Canal the importance of the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine with reference to the islands in and the territory bordering upon the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea becomes accentuated. Not only must that canal be protected, not only must that canal be kept open, but no foreign power must be permitted to secure a naval base within striking distance of that canal. And, mark you, the Monroe doctrine can not be enforced by remaining upon the defensive, by simply guarding our own coast, by simply repelling invasion. The territory to be protected is away from our shores. That doctrine must be enforced away from our shores, and in order to enforce it we must have a navy, and a navy large enough and strong enough to cope with that of any power which seeks to trespass upon it.

Mr. Chairman, we have assumed certain obligations in the Pacific; unwisely, I believe, but nevertheless we have assumed them. We have acquired territory far distant from our shores; and no matter what disposition we may finally make of those islands, as long as we hold them we must protect them. We may at some time in the future give the people of those islands their independence. We may sell those islands, but as long as they are ours we can not without national humiliation and national disgrace permit them to be taken from us. And even if we give these people their independence, we must guarantee that independence and must protect them in it. And I beg leave to remind the gentlemen who oppose a larger increase in our Navy that these far-distant possessions can not be defended, can not be protected by simply repelling invasion from our own coasts.

But, Mr. Chairman, our present Navy is not even sufficient for our own protection. As compared with other powers we have no army, and for the national defense are absolutely dependent upon the Navy. Admit, for the sake of the argument, that our present entire Navy is on a parity with that of France, Germany, or Japan. Our geographical position is such as to necessitate two navies. Our situation differs from that of any other power, European or Asiatic, except it be Russia, to which it is somewhat similar. Not only have we the Monroe doctrine to uphold in both the Atlantic and Pacific, and our island possessions to defend in the Pacific, but these United States front upon both oceans, with about 14,000 miles of foreign waters between our coasts. To transfer a fleet from one coast to the other, even during time of peace and under the most favorable conditions, requires a period of about three months, and in time of war, with every neutral port closed, with the consequent difficulties in coaling, it will be far more difficult and will require a far longer time. On the other hand, Japan's entire navy is in the Pacific. She has no Atlantic interests. Germany's entire coast line of only 800 miles is on the Atlantic, and her whole naval force is in Atlantic waters. Therefore, in comparing our Navy with that of Japan, the only proper basis of comparison is our Pacific Squadron as against Japan's entire navy; and in comparing our Navy with that of Germany, the only proper basis of comparison is our Atlantic Squadron as against Germany's full naval force.

Let me illustrate: If before December last war had broken out with Japan, before our Atlantic fleet could have reached our Pacific coast our island possessions would have been taken from us and our own Pacific coast ravaged, if not invaded. If to-day, Mr. Chairman, while that fleet is far distant in the Pacific, war should come with any European power, we would find the 10,000 miles of our Atlantic coast guarded by only five armored vessels, only two of them battle ships, which would soon be destroyed, and that coast and all the great cities upon it would be at the mercy of the enemy; and before our fleet could reach the scene of action, even if with the help of Providence we should have escaped invasion, the damage done would have been tenfold more than the cost of the combined navies of the world.

But, Mr. Chairman, even if our entire Navy is now upon a parity with those of France, Germany, and Japan, unless we more rapidly increase our Navy it will not long remain so. The naval programme of every power is such—they are building at such a rate—that in a very short time they will have far outstripped us. France has thirty-one armored vessels and is building six; Germany has twenty-seven armored vessels, is building five, and is about to lay down eight more, four this year and four next year. Japan has twenty-four armored vessels and has nearly completed four more, two of them of a type which when completed would equal any four of ours, and they have authorized the construction of seven more—and, mark you, these new vessels are of a class which in tonnage and armament far outclass any of the vessels of our present Navy. Mark you, further, that it requires us a year or two longer to build a battle ship than it does any other naval power. So it will be seen, Mr. Chairman, that unless we make more rapid increase in our Navy we will soon fall from the rank of a first-class to that of a second-class power. If we concentrate every vessel we possess in the Atlantic, leaving the Pacific coast unguarded, our Navy will be far inferior to that of Germany; and if we concentrate our entire Navy in the Pacific, leaving the Atlantic unguarded, our naval force will be far inferior to that of Japan.

Mr. Chairman, it is said here that we are a peaceable people, that because we have no designs on others we are not liable to engage in war. War is liable to be forced upon us at any time. Europe does not love us, not only because of our institutions, but because of our commercial supremacy. This is a commercial age, and commercial rivalry is the most fruitful source of trouble. Territory is seized and the weak are conquered now, not so much for mere expansion of territory, not

so much that subject people may pay tribute to a nation sovereign, but that a subject people may buy a nation's goods; and unless we are prepared to enforce the Monroe doctrine, the temptation to some commercial power to seize territory to the south of us upon this continent and thereby extend its trade will be well-nigh irresistible.

Mr. Chairman, the aim of every commercial nation of Europe and of Japan is to divide China into zones of influence, each with a commercial monopoly, with absolute control of commerce within its respective zone. We stand for the open door. Our commerce and our hope of commercial development and of commercial expansion demand it; but now, unless we are strong enough to make our wishes respected, how long think you will that door remain open to us?

And, Mr. Chairman, over and above all, in that inevitable conflict between the white and the yellow race, in that struggle for mastery which is bound to come, upon us will devolve the duty of maintaining the supremacy of the white race in the Pacific, and we must be prepared to perform that duty. That is our burden. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that not only patriotism but common sense and the honor and the safety of this country imperatively demand a more rapid increase in our Navy. The refusal to provide for such increase may now seem economy, but if war should in the future come upon us—and it will come—it will have been worse than folly; it will have been almost treason; almost a crime!

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I have any time left I yield it to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman is not here at this moment, and I ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss], to occupy some time.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB].

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, that great agnostic, brilliant orator and scholar, Col. Robert G. Ingersoll, on one occasion is said to have declared:

I am aware that there is a prejudice against any man who manufactures alcohol. I believe that from the time it issues from the coiled and poisonous worm in the distillery until it empties into the jaws of death, dishonor, and crime it demoralizes everybody that touches it from its source to where it ends. I do not believe anybody can contemplate the object without being prejudiced against the liquor crime. All we have to do, gentlemen, is to think of the wrecks on either bank of the stream of death, of the suicides, of the insanity, of the ignorance, of the destitution, of the little children tugging at the faded and withered breast of weeping and despairing mothers, of wives asking for bread, of the men of genius it has wrecked, the men struggling with imaginary serpents, produced by this devilish thing; and when you think of the jails, of the almshouses, of the asylums, of the prisons, of the scaffolds upon either bank, I do not wonder that every thoughtful man is prejudiced against this damned stuff called "alcohol." Intemperance cuts down youth in its vigor, manhood in its strength, old age in its weakness. It breaks the father's heart, bereaves the doting mother, extinguishes natural affection, erases conjugal love, blots out filial attachment, blights parental hopes, brings down mourning age in sorrow to the grave. It produces weakness, not strength; sickness, not health; death, not life. It makes wives widows, children orphans, fathers fiends; and all of them paupers and beggars. It feeds rheumatism, invites cholera, imports pestilence, and embraces consumption. It covers the land with idleness, misery, and crime. It fills your jails, supplies your almshouses, and demands your asylums. It engenders controversies, fosters quarrels, and cherishes riots. It crowds your penitentiaries, and furnishes victims for your scaffolds. It is the life blood of the gambler, the element of the burglar, the prop of the highwayman, and support of the midnight incendiary. It countenances the liar, respects the thief, esteems the blasphemer. It violates obligation, reverences fraud and honors infamy. It defames benevolence, hates love, scorns virtue, and slanders innocence. It incites the father to butcher his helpless offspring, helps the husband to massacre his wife, and the child to grind the parricidal ax. It burns up men, consumes women, detests life, curses God, despises heaven. It suborns witnesses, nurses perjury, defiles the jury box, and stains the judicial ermine. It degrades the citizen, debases the legislator, dishonors the statesman, and disarms the patriot. It brings shame, not honor; misery, not safety; despair, not hope; sorrow, not happiness, and with the malevolence of a fiend it calmly surveys its frightful desolation and unsatiated havoc. It poisons felicity, kills peace, ruins morals, blights confidence, slays reputation, and wipes out national honor, then curses the world and laughs at its ruin. It does all that and more. It murders the soul. It is the sum of all villainies, the father of all crimes, the mother of all abominations, the devil's best friend, and God's worst enemy.

Sir, was anything ever more truly or eloquently said? Has he added a lurid color to the picture that should not be there? It is a picture drawn by a master mind. It is not maudlin sentiment. It is his ripe judgment of the evils of alcohol, formed by a long life of wise observation.

Mr. Chairman, the problem of the regulation of the whisky traffic and its absolute prohibition has agitated the minds of the people of the United States for the last fifteen years more than any other one question.

No careful observer of the times will deny that public sentiment against the whisky traffic is growing stronger and stronger every day. Will any Member sitting before me deny this? Has not this mighty sentiment against the traffic and the saloon reached this Capital City and this legislative hall? Only a few years ago barrooms were maintained in this splendid Capitol building. Now not a drop of whisky is allowed to be sold anywhere within its mighty confines. The Congress took this step against the traffic. A few years ago the Army canteen flourished among our soldier boys, but not so now. This Congress has forbidden it.

In 1906 Congress passed a law requiring each collector of internal revenue to place conspicuously in his office for public inspection a list of all persons who have paid a special license tax in his district and to furnish a copy of such list of persons to any prosecuting officer of any State, county, or municipality upon demand by such officer.

The Hepburn-Dolliver bill passed this House by almost a unanimous vote on January 27, 1903, and died in the Senate. I verily believe, sir, that if a vote can be secured on that measure by the present membership of this House, it will pass again by a practically unanimous vote; and if it does so pass, it will not die so easily in the other end of the Capitol.

The minister of God thunders against the traffic because it destroys morality and blights human souls; business men oppose it because it retards prosperity and undermines business ability; the economist condemns it because it destroys $2,000,000,000 annually and gives nothing in return therefor. Even the owners of saloons demand sober men for bartenders. Great labor organizations are against the traffic because it brings poverty to so many of their members and unhappiness to so many homes. In fact, there is scarcely a class of men that will now defend the open saloon.

Those individuals who defend the saloon do so largely on the ground that it is the only way to control the traffic; not that the saloon is a good thing, but that it is the best solution of this vexing question. I have no fault to find with the man who honestly and sincerely believes this, but I do think that his judgment is faulty.

Mr. Chairman, the courts of the United States almost universally have condemned the whisky traffic. I have only time to quote from one judicial tribunal, and that is the Supreme Court of the United States, the greatest law body on earth:

We can not shut out of view the fact, within the knowledge of all, that the public health, the public morals, and the public safety is endangered by the general use of intoxicating liquors; nor the fact established by statistics accessible to everyone that the idleness, disorder, pauperism, and crime existing in the country are largely traceable to this evil.

This is the sentiment of the nine eminent judges who constituted this high court when this opinion in Mugler *v.* Kansas (123 U. S., 205) was written by Mr. Justice Harlan.

And, sir, I will pause long enough to quote from the supreme court of Kansas:

Probably no greater source of crime and sorrow has ever existed than social-drinking saloons. Social drinking is the evil of evils. It has probably caused more drunkenness and has made more drunkards than all other causes combined, and drunkenness is a pernicious source of all kinds of sorrow and crime. It is a Pandora's box, sending forth innumerable ills and woes, shame and disgrace, indigence, poverty, and want, social happiness destroyed, domestic broils and bickerings engendered, social ties sundered, homes made desolate, families scattered, heartrending partings, sin, crime, and untold sorrows, not even hope left, but everything lost, an everlasting farewell to all true happiness and to all nobler aspirations rightfully belonging to every true and virtuous human being.

Let it be understood, Mr. Chairman, that no man has the inherent or natural right to sell whisky. The right to sell it depends on the will of the people, for the United States Supreme Court, in the case of Crowley *v.* Christensen (137 U. S., 86) has declared:

There is no inherent right in a citizen to thus sell intoxicating liquors by retail. (It is not a privilege of a citizen of a State or of the United States.)

Therefore no barkeeper can cry that he is deprived of any inherent or natural right when the people, by their vote, tell him that he must not and shall not sell whisky within the borders of a county or State.

Abraham Lincoln once said:

The liquor traffic is a cancer in society, eating out its vitals and threatening destruction, and all attempts to regulate it will aggravate the evil. There must be no attempts to regulate the cancer. It must be eradicated. Not a root must be left behind (for until this is done all classes must continue in danger of becoming victims of strong drink).

Gladstone, once the great premier of England, said:

The drink traffic has caused more suffering, misery, and death than all the famines, pestilences, and wars during the nineteenth century.

United States Senator Carmack, of Tennessee, recently said:

The saloon, by its insolence, its arrogance, its persistent lawlessness, has forced the issue upon the people, and the people must meet it. (It refuses to be reformed. It must therefore be destroyed. It has proclaimed by its conduct that it would die rather than obey the law. In doing so it has left but one course for self-respecting and law-

respecting people. The time will come when men not now young will live to see the day when there will not be a saloon in any land where men go to church and children go to school.)

The churches are against the liquor traffic, as will witness the following resolution passed by the Methodist Church in its North Carolina annual conference:

We stand against the sale and manufacture of alcoholic liquors anywhere in the State of North Carolina, and for State prohibition. (We most earnestly hope that our lawmakers will procure the enactment of such laws as will fully protect us against the importation into prohibitory territory of any alcoholic stimulants from points without as well as within the State.)

The Baptist Church of North Carolina has also placed itself on record time and again against the whisky traffic. Here is the resolution adopted by the Baptist State convention without a dissenting vote:

We wish again to declare our uncompromising hostility to the liquor traffic as the great enemy of the peace and good morals of the people, the well-being of the home, and the work of the gospel among men. We congratulate the people of North Carolina on the splendid progress made in temperance in the last ten years, on the rising tide at this time to drive the traffic out of the State.

The Presbyterian, Christian, Episcopal, Lutheran, and other churches in North Carolina are equally opposed to the liquor traffic.

Bishop Fitzgerald not long ago stated:

The saloon is the chief and most audacious lawbreaker of the age. It is the arch destroyer of all that is dear to man. It is sleepless, restless, insatiable, mighty.

The great railway systems of the country oppose intemperance. The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad forbids intoxicants at any time, either on or off duty, by dispatchers, trainmasters, engineers, firemen, and conductors; and this great system declares that it has taken this step "for the protection of life, property, and good service." Other great railway systems of the United States have adopted similar rules and will not employ any person who uses intoxicants.

During the recent special session of the legislature in North Carolina a leading cotton-mill man of the State said to the house committee on liquor traffic:

Gentlemen, it is for you to say which you will encourage in North Carolina—cotton mills or liquor mills.

I honestly believe that the number of cotton-mill owners who favor the liquor traffic in the great State from which I come—and it has more cotton mills than any other State in the Union—can be counted on the fingers of one hand. I am equally sincere in the belief that less than 5 per cent of the honest, industrious, home-building cotton-mill operatives in North Carolina are in favor of the liquor traffic. It is the one great curse among them, and they are using their best efforts to stamp it out of existence.

The famous labor leader in England, John Burns, member of Parliament, recently declared to a great audience of workingmen in London, in discussing the liquor question:

I deem it my duty to say that but for drink and its concomitant evils our problem would be smaller and our remedies more effective.

I believe that the best and most simple remedy for drink is abstinence, but this must be supplemented by local or legislative action. One drink-cursed district, Liverpool, has since 1889 added 78,000 to its population, reduced its police drunkenness cases from 16,000 to 4,180, its crimes from 926 to 552 per 100,000, its policemen by 100, at a saving of £8,000 to the rates by the simple remedy of having got rid of 345 licensed places in eleven years. Thirty thousand friendly societies, with 12,000,000 members, have accumulated £40,000,000 in fifty years, or as much only as the nation spent on drink in any three months of last year.

No one knows better than the laboring man the blighting, desolating effects of whisky or to what depths of misery and shame it will drag him.

The following story is taken from one of the daily papers as a news item:

A man on being asked by some companions to go into a saloon and have a drink with them said:

"I won't drink any to-day, boys."

"What's the matter with you, old man?" asked one. "If you've quit, what's up?"

"Well, boys, I'll tell you. Yesterday I was in Chicago. I called on a customer of mine down on Clark street, who keeps a pawn shop in connection with his other business. While I was there a young man came in, wearing threadbare clothes and looking as hard as they make 'em. He had a little package in his hand. He unwrapped it and handed it to the pawnbroker, saying 'Give me 10 cents.' And what do you suppose it was? It was a pair of baby's shoes, little things with the bottoms only a trifle soiled, as though they had been worn only once or twice. 'Where did you get these?' asked the pawnbroker. 'Got 'em at home,' replied the man. 'My wife bought 'em for the baby. Give me 10 cents for 'em; I want to get a drink.' 'You had better take them back to your wife; the baby will need them,' said the pawnbroker. 'No, she won't; she's dead—baby died last night.' And then the poor fellow laid his head on the show case and cried like a child.

"Boys, I have a baby at home, and I'll not take a drink with you to-day."

Mr. Chairman, the merchant opposes the whisky traffic not only on moral grounds, but because he has learned that the saloon is an inveterate foe to thrift and industry and lessens the capacity of his debtor to meet his obligation.

The farmer is opposed to the liquor traffic. He takes the high moral ground that he has no right to license a system whose chief business it is to destroy character, increase crime, enlarge the pauper class, and darken homes. He opposes it on another ground—out in the rural districts, far from the protecting hand of policemen and sheriff, he knows the danger to his wife and daughter from the drunken negro whose blood is heated and whose brain is unbalanced by the use of bad liquor. The negro seems to have inherited an appetite for intoxicants, and, like the tiger when he tastes blood, the negro likewise when he becomes intoxicated becomes enraged. Where is the farmer in the East or in the West who would vote to establish a barroom in his community where every Saturday evening the negroes and trifling whites could congregate for their drunken revels and, dispersing during the afternoon and night, make it unsafe for men and positively dangerous for women to move along the public highways? Every mother and daughter would be filled with fright whenever she saw a drunken negro reeling and staggering along the highway near her home, and her first impulse would be to flee to her room and barricade the door. Let the farmers consult their wives and daughters as to whether or not the open saloon should exist in any country district of our fair State. For that matter, if you will leave the vote to the women of our State as to whether or not the saloon should exist in town or country, I guarantee the whisky traffic would not have one ballot in its favor.

Mr. Chairman, more than one-half of this great Republic of 80,000,000 people has already adopted prohibition laws. The following Commonwealths, aggregating a population of more than 9,000,000 people, have adopted absolute State prohibition, to wit: Alabama, Georgia, Kansas, Maine, North Dakota, and Oklahoma.

There are also fourteen other States in which prohibition campaigns are now being carried on, and each of these States is expected to adopt prohibition. I refer to the following States: South Carolina, Mississippi, Florida, Connecticut, Vermont, New Hampshire, District of Columbia, Tennessee, Arkansas, Iowa, Michigan, Missouri, Delaware, and North Carolina.

I believe that in less than two years prohibition will be adopted by Kentucky, Texas, West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Nebraska, Massachusetts, and South Dakota.

The liquor traffic is already outlawed in the following localities: Fifty counties out of 75 in Arkansas, 175 towns and cities in California, 50 towns and cities in Colorado, 75 out of 125 towns and cities in Connecticut, one-half of the State of Delaware, 30 out of 45 counties in Florida, 650 towns and cities in Illinois, 140 towns in Indiana, the entire State of Iowa except 25 cities, 90 out of 119 counties in Kentucky, 20 out of 59 counties in Louisiana, 15 out of 24 counties in Maryland, 125 out of 175 towns in Massachusetts, 400 towns and cities in Michigan, 400 towns and cities in Minnesota, 71 out of 75 counties in Mississippi, 84 out of 115 counties in Missouri, 250 towns and cities in Nebraska, 200 towns and cities in New Jersey, 700 towns and cities in New York, 20 towns and cities in little Rhode Island, 500 towns and cities in Ohio, 600 towns and cities and 20 counties in Pennsylvania, the entire State of South Carolina except about a dozen places, 70 out of 96 counties in Tennessee, 120 out of 246 counties in Texas, 50 out of 106 counties in Virginia, 40 out of 54 counties in West Virginia, 50 towns and cities in the State of Washington, 300 towns and cities in Wisconsin, and about three-fourths of North Carolina.

Sir, what a splendid territory is all this over which floats the white flag of prohibition!

The people of the United States are waking up to the fact that the whisky traffic is the most ruthless and reckless destroyer of property, character, and life that exists in our midst. Hon. Carroll D. Wright, while United States Commissioner of Labor, said:

I have looked into a thousand homes of the working people of Europe; I do not know how many in this country. I have tried to find the best and the worst; and while, as I say, the worst exists, and as bad as under any system, or as bad as in any age, I have never had to look beyond the inmates to find the cause; and in every case, so far as my observation goes, drunkenness was at the bottom of the misery, and not the industrial system or the industrial conditions surrounding the men and their families.

What a terrible arraignment is this! Is it anything short of remarkable that the people will license and tolerate a thing which is constantly destroying and tearing down what thrifty, energetic, and Christian people are building up?

Intoxicating liquors each year cost the people of the United States more than the price of their annual product of cotton,

corn, gold, silver, lead, and precious stones. The tariff taxes collected by the United States Government for a whole year would scarcely pay the liquor bills of our people for ninety days.

There are about 300,000 people engaged in the liquor business of this country, supplying whisky to about 5,000,000 drinkers, among whom about one-fifth are known as "hard drinkers." During one short year 295,000 people in only 140 cities have been arrested for drunkenness alone! Who, then, will gainsay the statement that the drink evil is the besetting curse of this Republic?

The people of the United States spend every year $1,500,000,000 for intoxicants. We can scarcely realize the magnitude of these figures. All of the gold, silver, copper, and nickel coined by the United States Government from its formation to the present time does not exceed $3,500,000,000; and yet the American people in one year's time spend a third of this amount of money for an article which not only does not help them, but which actually harms them in body and soul. Suppose this billion and a half of money were converted into other industries? It would give back to labor $325,000,000 in additional earnings and wages; it would give employment to 850,000 more laborers.

Mr. Chairman, it has been shown that the liquor traffic returns to labor only 6 cents out of every dollar of product and gives but 28 cents out of each dollar back to the owner of raw material, while manufacturers of shoes, boots, clothing, furniture, hardware, woolen and worsted goods return to labor an average of 23 cents out of every dollar and 50 cents for the owner of raw material.

James B. Dunn has summarized the cost of the liquor traffic to the people of the United States in the following figures:

Amount paid for liquors by consumers		$1,000,000,000
Value of grain, etc., destroyed		33,497,644
Cost of crime, insanity, pauperism, etc., chargeable to liquor traffic		137,762,220
Loss of productive labor		1,106,250,000
Shortened lives		147,000,000
Misdirected work		354,000,000
Total		2,678,504,864
Revenue from liquor traffic:		
Internal revenue	$107,695,910	
Customs	9,518,081	
State and local revenue	24,786,496	
		142,000,487
Net loss		2,536,504,377

There are in the United States about 200,000 saloons, costing the entire people the enormous sum of $2,500,000,000; in other words, each saloon costs the people of the community in which it exists an average of $12,000 every year. This is a frightful drain upon the honest industries of our country.

About 75 per cent of the paupers of the country are said to be addicted to the use of liquor. One or both of the parents of about one-half the paupers of the country were intemperate. About 40 per cent of the paupers of the country openly attribute their pauperism to their own intemperate habits.

The whisky traffic is a fruitful source of crime. In nearly 80 cases out of every 100 crime has been committed when the defendant was under the influence of intoxicants. Is it any wonder, therefore, that prohibition sentiment is growing stronger every day?

But some one will say, "I am opposed to prohibition because it does not prohibit." Such a person might as well say that he is opposed to the law against homicides and theft, because these laws do not prohibit such offenses.

Furthermore, the argument that prohibition does not prohibit is not a sound one, as is shown by the experience of those States that have adopted prohibition. Listen to the testimony from Maine. This State adopted prohibition in 1855, and at that time, to use the language of Gen. Neal Dow, she was "one of the most drunken and poorest States in the Union, there being seven distilleries and two breweries in Portland alone." At that time there were only five savings banks throughout the State of Maine, with only $90,000,000 deposits. To-day there are more than sixty of such banks, thirty building and loan associations, forty trust companies, aggregating deposits of more than $120,000,000. She has a greater proportion of school teachers to every 10,000 of her population and a greater proportion of teachers to her school population than any of the forty-five sister States of the Union. Sentences to jail have decreased in the last fifteen years 30 per cent and sentences for drunkenness have decreased 40 per cent in the same length of time. Governors of Maine for the last fifty years have testified to the success of prohibition there. James G. Blaine, Fessenden, Dingley, and Mr. LITTLEFIELD, the present able Representative in Congress from Maine, all testify to the success of prohibition in that State.

Governor Burke, of North Dakota, last year said:

We have had prohibition so long in North Dakota that in some counties there are no jails. There is not much cirme in the State.

Out of 105 counties in the State of Kansas, 21 of them have no paupers and only 25 counties have poorhouses, and in 55 counties there are no prisoners in the jails. In 37 counties there are no criminal cases on the dockets. There is no other State in the Union that has such a small number of paupers in proportion to its population or spends as much money for education in proportion to its population.

The State of Georgia put in operation her State prohibition law on the 1st of last January, and in two months crime had been reduced more than 50 per cent. Atlanta, Ga., is a great and busy city, with more than 100,000 population; and on January 4, 1907, while barrooms existed, there were sixty-three cases reported in the police court, while on January 4, 1908, under prohibition, there were only seventeen cases reported. On January 4, 1907, while barrooms flourished, thirty-two cases of drunkenness were reported to the police courts, while on January 4, 1908, under prohibition, not a single case was reported. The Atlanta Constitution recently said:

It was a transformed Decatur street which Atlantans saw yesterday afternoon and last night. The exchange was not so apparent in the matter of the number of people who were on the streets, but was found in the fact that it was a sober people, intent on business and legitimate amusement, who walked up and down this busy thoroughfare. Not a single person, white or negro, was seen under the influence of intoxicants.

A few months ago the people voted the saloons out of Wadesboro, N. C., and here is the testimony of one of the leading papers of that city:

Since saloons closed business in Wadesboro the police force has been reduced from five to three men, and no citizen here but will say that order here is better than before. If the commissioners find that three men can do the work it required five to do before, they will save the town more than $1,000 during the year.

On the 23d of January, 1908, the National American, a widely circulated newspaper published in Nashville, Tenn., contained a cartoon of a criminal dressed in prison clothes. On him was the inscription "The annual cost of crime to taxpayers of the country is $100,000,000." The convict is represented as making this pungent remark to the taxpayers:

This suit of clothes cost you a pretty penny. Some day you may get it through your head that it is cheaper to prevent crime than to punish it.

As whisky and the whisky traffic are responsible for about 80 per cent of the crime of our State, is it not plain that the best way to prevent crime is to abolish the whisky traffic?

So, Mr. Chairman, from high testimonials we can easily gather that prohibition is a blessing and a benefit morally and industrially to those States that have adopted it. Then, why should not the voters and citizens who love peace, revere the law, hate crime, and weep over sorrow, unite in one grand phalanx and on May 26 drive the saloon forever from the borders of our beloved and fair Carolina?

I know of no better way to close this imperfect address than by quoting from that lovely, loving, and beloved great Georgian, Henry W. Grady, whose untimely death prevented him from seeing his dream realized in prohibition for his Commonwealth, who, in discussing the whisky traffic, said:

To-night it enters an humble home to strike the roses from a woman's cheek, and to-morrow it challenges this Republic in the halls of Congress.

To-day it strikes a crust from the lips of a starving child and to-morrow levies tribute from the Government itself.

There is no cottage humble enough to escape it, no palace strong enough to shut it out.

It defies the law when it can not coerce suffrage.

It is flexible to cajole, but merciless in victory.

It is the mortal enemy of peace and order, the despoiler of men, and the terror of women, the cloud that shadows the face of children, the demon that has dug more graves and sent more souls unshrived to judgment than all the pestilences that have wasted life since God sent the plagues to Egypt and all the wails since Joshua stood beyond Jericho.

It comes to ruin, and it shall profit mainly by the ruin of your sons and mine.

It comes to mislead human souls and to crush human hearts under its rumbling wheels.

It comes to bring gray-haired mothers down in shame and sorrow to their graves.

It comes to change the wife's love into despair and her pride into shame.

It comes to still the laughter on the lips of little children.

It comes to stifle all the music of the home and fill it with silence and desolation.

It comes to ruin your body and mind, to wreck your home, and it knows it must measure its prosperity by the swiftness and certainty with which it wrecks the world.

[Loud applause.]

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield fifty minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT].

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss the question of battle ships. With some of us this is a question of money. With others it is a question of business. With me it is a question of principle and conscience, but with no one can it possibly be a question of partisan politics. Consequently every

man on either side of this Chamber will be free to exercise his own conscientious judgment and vote his own personal convictions.

At the outset I desire to call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that the naval programme provided for in this bill is in contravention of the policy which had heretofore been agreed upon as the American naval policy for the present and future. It had been wisely proposed and after much discussion practically decided that beyond the replacing, one by one, of the old hulls by new battle ships, a further increase of the Navy was not necessary. This wise and rational policy had my hearty support, the more so because I had taken a special interest in the movement for international arbitration and peace. Neither I nor any other American friend of that great cause, which contemplates the substitution of judicial decisions for brutal war, would have it said that we were unwilling to grant to our country such means of national defense as might become necessary in an emergency, however remote. I recognized the fact then, as I do now, that war can not be abolished by resolutions, and that as long as arbitration treaties do not extend to all causes of international discord, it is the patriotic duty of every nation to prepare for possible emergencies. And it was for still another reason that I supported that policy. It was to demonstrate that the advocates of peace are not impracticable theorists and dreamers who are ready to swap the safety of their country for a hobby, but men of affairs willing to "render unto Cæsar what is Cæsar's" in return for a cooperation of the governments toward a realization of their own humane and progressive ideas.

Since that time, Mr. Chairman, nothing has occurred which would justify us in departing from the policy we then adopted; hence, for one, I shall be obliged to adhere to it now, and in voting for one battle ship I believe to be as patriotic and as generous toward Cæsar as those who are willing to vote for more. [Applause.] It is not only true that nothing has occurred in the last two years to warrant an increase of naval armaments, but, on the contrary, we also know that a great deal has occurred since we last voted on battle ships which would justify all well-meaning governments in at least calling a halt in naval construction.

It may not be popular at a time when military and naval budgets are being considered to call attention to the great achievements of the Second Peace Conference at The Hague, but, for my part, I could not imagine a more appropriate time to do so; in fact, I hold it to be our solemn duty, before voting away the people's money, to carefully consider actual necessities, especially at a time when the revenues, both internal and customs, are falling off and every dollar we can spare is badly needed for the erection of buildings to house the growing Federal service and for the improvement of the waterways of the country. [Applause.] And, Mr. Chairman, the actual necessities for military and naval armaments have certainly been lessened by The Hague agreements.

It is true that no understanding was reached with regard to a reduction of armaments, but results have been achieved which, to my mind, are of infinitely greater importance. Armaments are, after all, only the symptom, while the men who were assembled at Holland's capital in the name of international peace applied the knife to the cause of their existence by agreements which are bound to hasten the advent of an era in which large armaments will be as unnecessary for the settlement of controversies between countries as they are between States of the Union to-day.

Let me briefly recapitulate what has been done at The Hague. A very much condensed report which I had the honor to submit to a recent meeting of the Arbitration Group in Congress, the American Branch of the Interparliamentary Union, contains this language:

The Second Hague Conference has now passed into history, but its achievements and results are comparatively little known, because of the fact that a large part of the press did not pay the attention to the conference which it deserved.

One far-reaching decision arrived at was that the conference should meet again. This practically assures the permanency of these great international congresses at which the foundation for more enduring peace between the nations is to be laid by a peaceful discussion of the questions which are of common concern to all. Furthermore, the conference practically agreed on the principle of obligatory arbitration, but instead of adopting a general treaty which would be binding for all and would specify the questions which must be settled by judicial decisions the powers agreed to leave the conclusion of such treaties to the separate nations, and it is to be noted with great satisfaction that President Roosevelt has already taken the initiative under these new Hague agreements by proposing arbitration treaties with France, Great Britain, Germany, Portugal, Italy, and other countries. For one, I should like to see Japan included in that list, and I am sure that such a proposition would be hailed with delight by that great oriental nation. The conference also agreed to the establishment of a Hague court on a more substantial basis by providing permanent judges for that great world tribunal. As I say, in principle this plan was sanctioned, but the appointment of the judges caused considerable dissension, which merely goes to show that when it comes to a question of patronage the greatest statesmen of the world can display just as much spirit as the ordinary politicians would over the division of the spoils. A tentative agreement, however, was reached and no doubt the powers will, by diplomatic negotiations, settle the question of these judgeships in the near future.

These are the questions relating to arbitration and to the peaceful settlement of international differences, but a great deal has also been accomplished in other directions, especially in well-meant efforts to make future war more humane. It would take up too much of your time to specify the many conventions concluded at The Hague, and as a great step forward I will mention only the one which provides that no unfortified cities, towns, and villages shall ever be bombarded by an enemy, which, in my humble judgment, makes the fortification of coast lines almost unnecessary. It means that by fortifying they would only invite the fire of the enemy, while they would be perfectly safe and immune if they remained unfortified.

Very few have an adequate idea of the intricacies of the questions which were discussed at The Hague, and while some people wonder why the conference should last so long, it is the greater wonder that it accomplished so much in so little time. There were forty-six nations represented, each with its peculiar interests and claims, and, in my judgment, it is due only to the growing sentiment of the people in favor of arbitration and peace which made agreement possible at all.

Lest I may be accused of undue optimism in thus relating how great an advance has been made in the direction of a state of international peace and order to be based on law and justice, instead of arbitrary force, permit me to supplement this report by cold facts. The Hague Conference approved not less than thirteen so-called conventions, namely, the following:

1. The peaceful regulation of international conflicts.
2. Providing for an international prize court.
3. Regulating the rights and duties of neutrals on land.
4. Regulating the rights and duties of neutrals at sea.
5. Covering the laying of submarine mines.
6. Prohibiting the bombardment of undefended ports, towns, villages, and buildings from the sea.
7. Forbidding the employment of force in the collection of contractual debts until after arbitration has been refused or an arbitral reward set at naught.
8. The transformation of merchantmen into war ships.
9. The treatment of captured crews.
10. The inviolability of fishing boats.
11. The inviolability of the postal service.
12. The application of the Geneva Convention and the Red Cross to sea warfare; and
13. The laws and customs regulating land warfare.

The approval of each of these thirteen conventions required unanimity of all of the forty-six governments represented. But for this requirement three more agreements would have been added to this record of international honor, namely, those providing for obligatory arbitration in specified cases, a supreme court of the world with seventeen permanent judges, and immunity of private property at sea in time of war. As to each one of these most important propositions there were but a few dissenting votes; hence from now on, let me say parenthetically, it will be the mission of all "pacifists" the world over to convert the dissenters. It is plain that this can be accomplished, not by an increase of armaments, but only by educational methods.

A contemporaneous writer has this to say on the Second Hague Conference:

Here was the parliament of man, about which we have been dreaming and singing for generations, actually realized under our eyes in plain prose in the year 1907. For the first real parliament of man it was, a congress in which the official representatives of practically all the nations of the world were gathered to confer and act upon the things which concern the interests of all nations alike. We have heard it called a failure and even a fiasco. It was neither. Its achievements were very great, even if they were not all which the peace workers of the world hoped for; and the meeting of the conference itself, with its earnest deliberations for four months, was something of high significance quite aside from any particular measures which it agreed upon. If we would estimate definitely how far its actual achievements meet the demands of the world's peace party, we must measure them by those demands as formulated by the Interparliamentary Union at its convention in London in 1906, for those London resolutions constitute the working platform of the world's peace party to-day—the platform for which all will steadily work until it is entirely written into international law.

The six demands of the Interparliamentary Union, which consists of 2,500 members of the different national parliaments of the world, men who are devoted all of them to the cause of peace and arbitration, were for (1) a regular international parliament; (2) a general obligatory arbitration treaty; (3) the proportional limitation of national armaments; (4) the inviolability of ocean commerce in war; (5) impartial commissions to investigate and report to the world upon all differences between two nations which can not be settled by diplomacy or arbitration before any declaration of war; and (6) national peace budgets—regular appropriations by the different governments to promote international friendship and good understanding.

The arrangement for the meeting of a Third Hague Conference practically assures a regular international parliament hereafter; and this assurance of a regular international parliament is one great outcome of the Second Hague Conference, as the international tribunal was the memorable outcome of the first conference. A general arbitration treaty was not accepted by all the powers represented at The Hague, such unanimity being necessary for action; but it was voted by an enormous majority, and independent treaties between the different nations are sure now to multiply rapidly until all nations are included. Secretary Root is at this moment negotiating treaties between ourselves and several nations. A great majority of the nations voted in favor of the immunity from capture of all private property at sea in time of war, showing that this is the judgment of the enlightened

world to-day. Definite action to this end was blocked by Great Britain, as discussion of the limitation of armaments was blocked by Germany.

While The Hague Conference should be treated with justice, the fact that there is in large circles in the most progressive nations such general expression of discontent with the outcome of its work is a witness to the large demand which thoughtful people everywhere are now making in the matters which concern the peace and better order of the world. This is most hopeful; and these demands will steadily grow larger and more emphatic until the barbarous old war system of the nations is supplanted by rational methods worthy of to-day's civilization, and quarrels between nations are settled in the courts as a matter of course, as they are now settled between individuals. We Americans, who know the history of our constitutional convention of 1787 and how difficult it was to organize these thirteen States into one Union, will not fail to be properly patient while the vastly greater work of organizing half a hundred nations, with their varying systems of law, prepossessions, and prejudices, goes on. Let us also not fail to do our part in the creation of such an energetic and influential public opinion as shall make the United States a leading and potent factor in the organization of the united world.

Without special reference to the great propositions tending to prevent future war, Gen. Horace Porter, one of the leading American delegates to The Hague, has summarized those results of the conference which are intended to regulate future war in the following language:

The conference has affirmed in many directions the rights of neutrals against those of belligerents. It has placed restrictions upon the use of floating mines, which have been a menace to the commerce of the world, without impairing the right of nations at war to use anchored mines for self-defense. It has peremptorily forbidden the bombarding of undefended seacoast towns and villages. It has prohibited the levying of contributions by threat of bombarding. It has done much to strengthen security against the atrocities which often occur in war. It has shielded the noncombatant. It has strengthened the provisions for the relief of the wounded. It has taken strict precautions against a revival of privateering in naval war by insisting that when merchant vessels are converted into cruisers they shall be formally enrolled on the naval list and placed in command of a duly commissioned naval officer, with a crew subject to naval discipline. Such questions as contraband of war and blockade, though no agreement was reached, and on every important question which came before us we have made a great and truly marvelous advance toward an agreement on more civilized lines. So great indeed has been the growth of international sentiment that it is probable that at the conference of the leading naval powers which England intends to summon in 1908 we shall find ourselves able to settle some questions which have been a source of difference for a hundred years. It was America that proposed the Permanent Court of Arbitral Justice—not a mere court of arbitration, but a judicial court composed of the ablest jurists of all nations, representing all systems of law and all languages.

In view of this testimony who will dare to deny that the results of The Hague Conference, besides mitigating the atrocities of future wars, will also tend—and this concerns us now—to materially lessen the possibilities of war? While causes of friction may continue to exist, their removal by peaceful means and without bloodshed has been made possible by the acceptance, at least in principle, of the judicial mode of settling such differences. Well-meaning governments will readily avail themselves of this weapon—if I may use the word—to save human life, a weapon forged in the heat of that civilization which impels our warfare upon war. It is fully realized by the cabinets of the world that what was accomplished at The Hague was inspired by, and a concession to, the overwhelming sentiment of the civilized nations; hence it is this sublime sentiment, and not the war spirit of the middle ages, which should be the guiding star of modern governments. If European rulers are willing to repudiate the concession they have just made at The Hague to the high moral thought of the twentieth century; if, by increasing their armaments in the wake of the Peace Congress, they wish to commit an act of infidelity and bad faith against themselves, we can not stop them; but let us hope that no American Government may ever be a party to such duplicity. [Applause.]

It was in response to an invitation issued by the United States that the Second Hague Conference met. An American representative wrote the resolution which the Interparliamentary Union adopted on American soil, and upon which President Roosevelt acted by issuing that invitation. The main planks in the platform of the Interparliamentary Union are of American origin, and these same propositions were the principal topics of discussion at The Hague. The project, too, of a permanent court of arbitral justice was substantially an American proposal, as was the agreement to eliminate force in the collection of contractual debts. The official American delegates—and as an observer I was proud of them—occupied the center of The Hague stage, and their influence was practically unlimited because everybody believes in the sublime sincerity of America's peace mission. [Applause.]

As a result, General Porter was justified in saying that—

The great achievement of the conference has been to push forward in every department of international life American principles.

In playing that rôle before the eyes of the world we, on our part, are simply true to American traditions. We are merely obeying the lessons taught us by every President from Washington to Roosevelt. But we have thus created an impression abroad which every instinct of honor impels us to live up to at home. That impression is that our experiment for self-government is a success, inasmuch as it makes for peace and is a sure guaranty of permanent relief from excessive military burdens. As a result, the people of all the world look to the United States for salvation. They have seen us take the lead in a movement for a new dispensation and are taking us at our word. Consequently our prestige depends upon our consistency. The very moment we begin aping the Old World in its mad rivalry for military power and splendor we shall descend to the level of the old monarchies. [Applause.] The difference between popular self-government based on democratic virtues, on the one hand, and monarchical government resting on military power and prowess on the other, will be wiped out. The light of hope which our example had lit in the human hearts everywhere will be extinguished, and we ourselves shall stand convicted of treachery to the most cherished American traditions. [Applause.]

Viewed from this standpoint the question of expense, it is true, becomes a minor issue, and for one I would rather vote for ten times the cost of a dozen new battle ships if I could thereby prevent their construction and thus aid not only in maintaining American prestige the world over, but also in demonstrating the sincerity of our professions, and last, not least, the superiority of republican over monarchical institutions. [Applause.]

Let us take a look around. Germany has recently enlarged her naval budget, but whatever reasons she may have had for her action, they surely do not concern us. Great Britain, though she has twice proposed an arrest of armaments by international agreement, is obliged to follow suit—in fact, William T. Stead insists that England's answer should be two new ships to each one Germany is building. Some do not seem to see it that way, but Stead's purpose is, of course, to demonstrate the absurdity of this continued rivalry, and it is to be hoped that his object lesson may eventually be understood. But whatever the British Government may do, its eyes are certainly on the Continent of Europe and not on us. We have little to fear from any European power, and even less from Japan, all jingo talk to the contrary notwithstanding. [Applause.]

Unless we are all in ignorance as to the true situation—and it is incredible that the Mikado's diplomatic representatives should misrepresent it to us—a simple agreement to arbitrate differences and to mutually guarantee territorial integrity and undisputed home sovereignty would effectually dispose of the Japanese question for all time to come, and not a single battle ship will be needed to secure the benefits of such a treaty.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I am very sorry, but my time is so limited that I can not yield. There is, then, no cloud in our diplomatic sky, and never before in our history were our relations with the greater powers more friendly than they are to-day. If this were not true, we, as the people's representatives, would certainly know it, for we are happy to have an Administration which from the first has taken the people into its confidence. There is neither political nor commercial necessity for trouble of any kind, and, what is more, the American people have the confidence in President Roosevelt and his great Secretary of States to know, first, that no aggressive war would ever be waged by them; secondly, that our affairs with all the world are being administered on the basis of fair dealing and with even-handed justice to all; and thirdly, that even in case of a controversy with any country, big or small, they would be eager to again furnish an object lesson to the world, as the present Administration has done before, by taking advantage of The Hague judicial machinery for its arbitrament.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I believe every Member of the House to be justified, from the standpoint of international obligations as well as that of national security and national honor, in declining to go beyond the naval programme as agreed upon at the two sessions of the last Congress, and which means one new battle ship each year to replace an old one. And I repeat that this is most generous, because since then the possibilities of war have been greatly lessened and the prospects of more lasting peace correspondingly brightened.

We hear so much of late of an adequate navy. Can anyone tell me what that is? Certainly there is no measure by which to gauge it, and there is no principle, scientific or other, governing any change above or below present proportions, except the time-honored American tradition that the United States will neither engage in a war of conquest nor ever take the offensive for any purpose except for national defense. The only rule to guide us, then, is the right of self-protection, and I claim the American Navy in its present strength is adequate to vouchsafe our national security, for in our estimates we must not overlook

those battle ships which have just been completed, namely, the *Mississippi*, the *Ohio*, and the *New Hampshire*, and the armored cruisers *North Carolina* and *Montana*, or those which have been authorized and are now in course of construction, namely, the *South Carolina*, *Michigan*, *Delaware*, and *South Dakota*, all of the latter four being 20,000-ton ships. This makes an addition to our present strength of seven big battle ships and two armored cruisers. It may be argued that since other nations are keeping on building new battle ships we must follow suit in order to maintain a proportionate measure of protection; but, if true, was not this just as true a year and two years ago when we announced we would go no further? In this connection let me ask you, gentlemen, What has protected us and vouchsafed our security since 1812—that is, during the last hundred years? It certainly was not the Navy, because up to the eighties, with the exception of the civil-war period, we practically had none.

If any European nation ever had any designs on us, the time for it to come on would certainly have been during the last few weeks while our battle ships are bottled up in the Pacific Ocean and can not reach the Atlantic in less than two months. For three months our whole eastern coast has been completely exposed to attacks by European navies, but if there was a whisper or a suggestion of such a thing on the part of any power I have not heard of it. Oh, but you say, we now have the Philippines to protect, an obligation which did not exist up to a few years ago. Let me remind you that this obligation did exist when we last agreed on our naval programme, with the advice and consent of President Roosevelt, who said in April, 1906:

> We are no longer enlarging our Navy. We are simply keeping up its strength.

Surely no danger threatens the country to-day that was not known then. America's experience in and with the Philippines has been carefully watched and studied in the cabinets of the world, and from the expressions I have heard on my European trips I am led to believe that not one of the great powers would accept the islands even as a present. In holding them, as we were in honor bound to do, we have made the greatest sacrifices of blood and treasure. [Applause.] But if, on account of them, Uncle Sam is to become one of the war lords; if, for fear of losing them, we are expected to take part in the mad rivalry in naval construction, and if we are to go back on our Hague pledges, I assert frankly that this would entail a sacrifice too great to make, because it involves one of high principle. And, gentlemen, do not let us forget that fully as much as may have been added to our cares by the acquisition of the Philippines has been taken from us in another section of the world. The adoption of the Drago doctrine by The Hague Conference, putting an end to all forcible collection of debts from one nation by another and removing at a stroke most of our real or fancied responsibility for the South American republics, surely cuts off an immense fraction of our own naval needs.

One argument remains to be answered. It is the seductive plea that we should make it our mission to enforce the peace of the world by sheer naval strength. In other words, the United States should declare peace to be the rule of the world and put down war, the exception wherever and whenever it occurs. "Difficile est satiram non scribere!" Our good Uncle Sam is to be a sort of international bully, the universal policeman charged with the duty of enforcing the peace of the world with a big stick bigger than all other big sticks on earth. [Laughter and applause.] But the prophets of "the peace-promoting power of a great navy" appear really to be in earnest. Evidently it has not occurred to them that a navy so powerful as to meet their ideas of adequacy might become a menace not only to the world's peace which they hope to enforce, but also to our own liberties. Besides, it will be difficult to convince the ordinary intellect that two pistols in a man's pocket will better vouchsafe the peace of his neighbors—or his own, for that matter—than one pistol or no pistol at all. And from their view point what would be an adequate navy? If the size of our armaments is to be the only measure of our peace and safety, we would have to have a navy certainly larger than the most powerful now in existence, namely, that of Great Britain, and, in fact, larger than that of all the great powers combined. Otherwise we would be in constant danger of being overawed, because a combination of powers against us is not altogether impossible. I ask you in all seriousness, Is this not the true logic of the plea for a bigger navy if, as its prophets say, the peace and security of the United States depended on it alone?

But do these prophets draw this logical conclusion. Oh, no; their own reasoning evidently seized them with dizziness, for instead of asking for a hundred or a hundred and fifty new *Dreadnoughts*, as they should do, they content themselves with a demand for two, or four, or six, or whatever they can get. But prompted by the reasoning of the Navy boomers, let me ask the foolish question, What is to become of us in the meantime? Even if their most extravagant demands were granted by Congress, and granted annually, it would surely take a quarter of a century before we could cope with England and the united European powers in naval strength. Where would be our security in all these years to come? Would our friends petition Europe to kindly wait until we are ready? Or will they stand idly by while 80,000,000 people shudder and tremble in agonizing terror for twenty-five long years? Certain it is that the same danger which is now threatening us in the imagination of our friends has existed for a hundred years. How fortunate we did not know it!

In civilized society an individual is secure, not because he carries weapons, but because he is honest, law-abiding, righteous, and peaceful. The same is true of a nation, especially since arbitrary power is more and more being curtailed by international obligations. Our own national security from foreign foes has never depended on our immediate military prowess, but was and is the result of righteousness, love of peace, and other civic virtues as much as of our limitless resources, reserved strength, and geographical isolation. This has become an American axiom, and if it was true at a time when might was right without equivocation, how much more must it be true when the nations of the earth, in solemn conclave, have resolved to dethrone arbitrary power and force, and, instead, worship at the shrine of international justice! [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, contrary to common report, I am by no means a sentimentalist on this question. My course was as practical as the demands of patriotism and the necessities of my country dictated, and I repeat what I said in the beginning, that as in the past I am ready now to support President Roosevelt's policy announced a year ago, namely one battle ship annually, which, to use his own language, means no enlargement of the Navy, but merely "enables us to keep up our strength and make good the units which become obsolete." On this platform I propose to stand, and I shall go no further, believing as I do that even the battle ships we now have will never be needed except for show.

Mr. Chairman, in a remonstrance against further naval increases, which was recently sent to Congress by several hundred of the leading clergymen of the city of New York and by 150 ministers of Boston, I find the following language:

> Sixty-five per cent of the national income is now expended on war, past and present. The increase of our naval budget has recently been used in the French Assembly as a reason for increasing its own; is largely responsible for the increase of armaments among Asiatic nations, and is well-nigh certain to retard the reduction in the armaments of the world, for which we have so long been waiting. The growing discontent throughout the world at the appalling increase of waste of national resources must be heeded. We feel that this protest is the more necessary inasmuch as there are various new and effective methods now available for promoting international friendship and rationally settling difficulties which these demands seem to ignore.

This is the whole case in a nutshell. But do we realize the gravity of the indictment which the church hurls against us in these words, namely, that instead of continuing our peace preparations in deference to American professions at The Hague we are going back on our word and, by our bad example, are stimulating other nations to feverish preparations for war? Is this the mission of a Republic as the fathers have understood that mission? Is it in accord with that American policy, already referred to, which the founders of the Republic have laid down and which, by the baptism of experience, has become a national maxim? No, gentleman, every American impulse drives us in the opposite direction. We thoughtlessly reiterate the phrase that we are building battle ships to preserve the peace. It is the merest cant. Why not be honest? Why not say, "We want them to lick the other fellow in case of trouble?"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman from Tennessee give me three minutes more?

Mr. PADGETT. I would be glad to, but my time is more than promised.

Mr. HOBSON. With the permission of the gentleman from Tennessee in charge of the time, I will yield five minutes of my time to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

If we honestly want peace, Mr. Chairman, we should prepare for peace. And of all the nations on earth, we Americans should be the last to accept a peace which is offered only on the points of bayonets, because that peace is the kind despots graciously offered their subjects at all times, even in the darkest periods of the world's history. To secure it we need no arbitration treaties and peace conferences. But in this enlightened age the people are entitled to a peace based on right

and not on might. A new era has dawned upon the human family since in 1899 the nations first came together to proclaim law as a substitute for war. The question is, Shall we go forward or backward? One government must take it upon itself to call a halt in armaments, not by paper resolutions, but by actual example, and there is no country on earth which is in so fortunate a position to do it as is the United States. We have no enemy. We are isolated. Our Navy is big enough for our protection. We have no axes to grind and none except peaceful conquests to make.

No suspicion of weakness could attach to our good example, because all the world knows that we are richer in actual wealth and resources than any other nation. And now is the time, because the development of international law, the better organization of nations in mutual respect, and the multiplication of treaties of arbitration constitute the dominant note in contemporary history. The war against war is the commanding cause of to-day, as the war against slavery was the commanding cause of the period before us—that is, in the language of Andrew Carnegie:

The great duty of our generation is to put a stop to man killing, as the great work of Lincoln's generation was to put a stop to man selling.

May the United States lead in this sacred cause! There is more glory in it in one day than on a hundred battlefields in a thousand years. [Prolonged applause on both sides of the Chamber.]

[Mr. SIMS addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LAMAR].

Mr. LAMAR of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, while we are in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union I desire to submit a few remarks which I trust may not be inappropriate.

Thousands of years ago the command was given to Moses and written upon tables of stone, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Almost every State in this Union, if not all, have on their statute books legislation in some form or another prohibiting the violation of the Sabbath day, but it seems that the men who have molded and shaped the legislation of the nation have neglected to enact such a law for the District of Columbia.

Some weeks ago, while looking over the Monday morning's paper, I found that on the day previous a minister in this city had delivered a sermon on Sabbath observance, and had therein made a statement that there is no law in the District of Columbia prohibiting work on Sunday or forbidding the sale of goods, wares, and merchandise on the Sabbath. I was very much surprised and thought that, undoubtedly, the author of the remark must be mistaken. On reaching the Capitol I went to the library and examined the District Code, and could find no law on the subject.

In order to be sure, however, I called up the office of Major Sylvester and inquired about it and received a reply that the minister was correct, and that there was and is no law in the District of Columbia requiring the observance of the Sabbath day. I immediately framed and introduced a bill modeled largely after the statutes of my own State, prohibiting work (except work of necessity and charity) and prohibiting the sale of goods, wares, and merchandise in the District of Columbia on Sunday. That bill is now pending before the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I desire to discuss it to some extent, or, rather, to discuss the reasons why the Sabbath is not reverenced as it once was, and some of the conditions of the present age which are, in my judgment, responsible for the present tendencies to Sabbath desecration.

"But how the subject theme may gang
Let Time and Chance determine;
Perhaps it may turn out a song;
Perhaps it may turn out a sermon."

I would not abandon the improvements and advantages of the age, but in the wake of the good some evils are following; together with the virtues are linked some vices. I confess that all this riotous, confusing, bewildering bustle and energy of the age which our materialistic progress and rapid advance have brought in their wake indicate to me tendencies which I do not believe promote true progress or elevate humanity.

"'Tis not in titles nor in rank,
'Tis not in wealth like London Bank,
Can make us truly blest;
If Happiness ha'e not her seat and center in the breast,
We may be wise or rich or great, but never can be blest."

This seems to be an age of materialism; an age when the notion that happiness must come from without and not from within appears to have seized upon us all; an age when the practical seems to have smothered and strangled the ideal and when the doctrine seems to have gained full acceptance that happiness can only be attained through the acquirement of our most selfish ambitions. With one, perhaps, it is social preferment, with another political honors, and with others professional reputation, and with the great mass the acquirement of wealth; and, forgetting all else, forgetting and neglecting the development of the better elements of humanity, and each goes through the days and weeks and years, chasing this chimera, this phantom of a delusive hope, until the grave claims him, forgetting that—

"The boast of heraldry, the pomp of pow'r,
And all that beauty, all that wealth e'er gave,
Await alike the inevitable hour.
The paths of glory lead but to the grave."

With the evolution of our modern civilization many of the conditions and circumstances which made possible that high development of mental and physical vigor which has characterized American manhood is vanishing, and men are rapidly losing much of that brawny physical development and that spirit of self-reliance which enabled our fathers to carve States out of a virgin wilderness, and to lay the foundations of our present national greatness. Man's life to-day in the busy whirl of the city and in the congested centers of our population is along the line of specifics; to eat and drink and sleep and work, and almost think by some street car time-table; in all of the varied branches of industry large establishments are reaching out and swallowing up the smaller, and the work is apportioned and subdivided, so that it makes a machine of a man.

I am told that more than 200 different men contribute to the work of finishing a single shoe; each has his own particular employment; learns nothing else; knows nothing else, but to toil at a single bench so many hours each day from day to day and year to year. To turn a single crank or do a single piece of work reduces the man to an automaton, destroys his self-reliance and independence, makes of him a machine that unfits him for everything else, saps his vitality, and places the hundreds of thousands of laboring men at the mercy of their employers, and destroys the sturdy spirit of self-reliance which a century ago impelled men to go forth into a wilderness and subdue a continent and lay the foundations for our future civilization. [Applause.]

This tendency not only reaches the day laborer, but embraces within its influences all the varied business interests and the professions. This is an age of specialties and specifics. The broadax is being displaced by the keener and more polished razor blade. In the legal profession, in the cities, much of the work is done by large firms, which employ their men at a salary, each man having his own specific work in the profession and paying no attention to any other; and the young men now graduating from our law schools, in many cases, instead of launching out upon an independent career and relying upon their own strength and resources, are becoming clerks at a salary in the offices of these firms, and enter upon the ceaseless grind of the same routine day after day, until a wrecked constitution and a sapped manhood tell the result at thirty-five or forty.

Day after day they rise, glance over the headlines of a metropolitan paper while at breakfast; pass over the same street car lines, enter the same office at the same time, see the same walls, discuss business at lunch, go home at the same hour every evening, follow a ceaseless routine which robs life of its zest, and takes away its ambitions and aspirations and renders impossible that growth and development which makes an all-round man; and this is the life experience of thousands of busy business men. They have no time for the cultivation of their higher nature; no time to educate the ethical and moral side of their being; and by 35 or 40 they are dyspeptics, their hopes and their ambitions starved and their manhood dwarfed by the conditions attending the spirit of the age.

And this moving, seething, restless, consuming rush to reach the front of the procession and keep in touch with the spirit of the times and maintain their place against the fierce competition of the age; pervades all the industrial and social world, all the avenues of life, and even reaches into childhood with its blighting influences. Children are born amid such surroundings and into this atmosphere. Boys, as soon as they are large enough to wear knee pants and speak distinctly, are put in positions as bell boys, messenger boys, elevator boys, etc., and join the mad rush and whirl and become prematurely old, instead of spending the days of innocent childhood in the development of brain and muscle, inhaling and absorbing strength of mind and body, and developing those powers and faculties which will give them that vigor and strength so necessary for a useful and happy manhood. I am really sorry for the boy that has never known the experience of running through a brier patch

barefooted, of having colic from eating green apples, or has never had a stone bruise on his heel. [Laughter and applause.]

It was in savage time that woman was a slave and served her master in menial tasks. We are fast on the road to a new savagery. The journey began when the discovery of machinery and the factory system took the place of the man and the tool. Greedy employers bade the delicate fingers of womanhood and the dimpled hand of childhood grasp the fallen task, and haggard faces and puny frames are to be seen as the result in our manufacturing cities. But economic conditions know no chivalry.

The census of 1900 shows there were at that time five and one-quarter millions of female breadwinners in the United States, and a majority of them were under the ages of 25 years. There were at that time nearly 500,000 girls between 10 and 15 years of age earning their own living. The great fact of the last decade is the enormous increase of working girls under the age of 18 years. The number of breadwinners among the women in the continent in the United States increased from 2,353,000 in 1880 to 4,833,000 in 1900, an increase of more than 105 per cent.

Twenty per cent, or one-fifth of the women in the country over the age of 16 years, in 1900 were earning their own living. The tendency is toward the labor of women and children because it is cheaper. In 1900 more than 1,000,000 women were engaged in earning their own living who would not have been in such occupations had conditions and tendencies remained the same as they were in 1880.

Women constitute 73 per cent of the teachers and professors in colleges, 83 per cent of the boarding-house keepers, 86 per cent of the launderers, 82 per cent of the servants and waiters, 28 per cent of the clerks and copyists, 31 per cent of the packers and shippers, 76 per cent of the stenographers and typewriters, 81 per cent of the paper box manufacturers, 29 per cent of the telephone operators, 50 per cent of the bookbinders, 62 per cent of the glove manufacturers, 50 per cent of the operatives in textile mills, 42 per cent of the operatives in carpet factories, 48 per cent of the cotton-mill operatives, 72 per cent of the operatives in hosiery and knitting mills, 58 per cent of the silk operatives, 40 per cent of the woolen-mill operatives, 77 per cent of the textile workers, 99 per cent of the dressmakers, 96 per cent of the seamstresses, 77 per cent of the collar and cuff makers, and 69 per cent of the other textile workers.

A large part of the manufacturing of the United States is now done by women. In the meantime we are sapping the strength of the nation by draining the life of its future mothers. We may well be ashamed of the appliances of the age when we remember that they mean the lifeblood and the agony of delicate womanhood, the paralysis of our homes, the stopping and decay of that abounding physical vigor and vitality which has marked us for a century; because America has been hitherto the paradise of woman. Make our women beasts of burden and the doom of our strength is at hand. No army can be more vigorous than the mothers who bore them.

Within the last few years we have had a curious type of woman, a kind of prodigy; "the new woman," who thinks home life and motherhood a disgrace; whose highest ideal seems to be to check and smother and utterly eliminate from her nature all those attributes of tenderness and modesty which have ever been the chief charm of her sex and have always inspired a spirit of reverence and chivalry in manhood. The chief ambition of the new woman seems to be to spend as much time as possible at the club and as little as possible in the home, to clamor for the ballot and the lecture platform, and bestow her affections on a poodle dog. The woman who calls to our minds the thoughts of angels and heaven is not the new woman on the lecture platform, the one marking the ballot, nor the modern club woman, but the one around the hearthstone. The purest altar from which a prayer ever ascended was from a mother's knee, and the holiest, sweetest recollection man ever had were of home, childhood, and mother. If anything on earth, within the range of human possibilities, can move an angel to rejoice and strike the golden harp with a sweeter refrain it is a mother singing lullabies around the cradle of infancy, and making the home what the dear old simple homes of the land were to many of the present generation, a heaven on earth, a paradise of sweet memories for all coming years.

"But forever and forever,
As long as the river flows,
As long as the heart has passions,
As long as life has woes."

Such memories as in after years, when careworn and heartsick, carry us back to the sunny days of childhood, and prompt the plaintive cry of the tried soul—

"Backward, turn backward, O Time in your flight,
Make me a child again, just for to-night."

We may for a passing moment admire the tinsel and the glitter of the fashionable belle; but we worship and revere, and would die for, the mother that taught our infant lips to lisp their first prayer. It is an enigma why women aspire to be masculine. All experience and all history teach us that it is the womanly woman that commands the respect and admiration of her own and succeeding generations. It is that type of woman whom the artists have delighted to paint, and whom the poets have been inspired to describe.

Mrs. Browning's "Aurora Leigh," Tennyson's "Dora," "Ami," "Maud," and "The Princess," Owen Meredith's "Lucile," Longfellow's "Evangeline," Whittier's "Maud Muller," and Burns's "Highland Mary" could never have been conceived or written of the "new woman."

If the new woman had been in fashion when Byron lived, instead of writing the lovely lines—

"She walks in beauty like the night,
Of cloudless climes and starry skies,"

he probably would have written—

She walks in bloomers sorter tight,
The cynosure of staring eyes.

[Applause.]

If Whittier were writing Maud Muller now, instead of saying—

"Maud Muller, on a summer's day
Raked the meadow sweet with hay,"

he probably would write—

Maud Muller, on a summer's day,
Got on her "bike" and sped away,
'Neath her plug hat glowed the wealth
Of manlike beauty and buxom health.

[Applause.]

We are departing from the old landmarks. Not only the old methods and old social customs, but the old literature and the old books are abandoned; and I might say that during this Administration the Constitution of the fathers is unheeded and disregarded. It seems to be an age when we are launching out on a new sea without chart or compass. [Applause.]

The very intellectual atmosphere which surrounds us, and into which our children are born and in which they live and grow to mature years, is surcharged with the spirit of this bewildering restlessness of the twentieth century and perverting the literary tastes of modern society, to satisfy which a sensational press is continually pouring into the homes of the nation literature breathing doctrines and sentiments which half a century ago the fathers and mothers would have banished from their homes as deadly poison. The editions of Trilby and Quo Vadis—the one a biography of a habitué of the Latin Quarter of Paris, and the other depicting scenes of licentiousness and debauchery which would bring a blush of shame to the cheek of a courtesan—run into the hundreds of thousands, set in a flutter the literary folk of two continents; while the old masters who furnished the intellectual food and strength and inspiration of a generation ago are neglected. The presses of the country are continually pouring forth a mass of literature to satisfy the morbid tastes of the present generation. Three Weeks runs into hundreds of thousands, and must be read if one is to discuss literary matters in a fashionable parlor. But does anyone believe his wife, daughter, or sister would be a wiser, purer, or better woman for having read it?

Run over the list of books advertised by the leading publishers of to-day, the editions of some of which run into the hundreds of thousands, and whose sales in the last decade have been at the head of the list, and how barren they are of any thought or sentiment calculated to strengthen the mind or furnish food for the soul. James Lane Allen's Reign of Law is rank infidelity. The Chofer and Life's Shop Window ought to be banished from the mails. A long list of others may engage the fancy for a passing hour, but fail to leave the mind wiser or the heart purer.

Much contained in our popular magazines, those which are supposed to present the cream of the intellectual world, breathes the spirit of iconoclasm destructive of the old landmarks and the faith of our fathers, inculcating notions of materialism and higher criticism and, too often, of absolute infidelity.

How often the old folks at home have toiled and economized and after years of self-denial sent the son in whom their affection centered and whose future held their fondest hopes to the university, that he might have a finished education, and found after a few years in a modern university that, in proportion as he learns football and attends the Greek letter societies he forgets his father's Bible and his mother's faith; that while the things supposed to make him a finished scholar were being crowded into his mind the lessons learned around the hearthstone were smothered out; that with his lessons in science,

as taught to him by the modern lecturer, came the conviction that the account of creation is a myth and the Gospel of the Evangelists a superstition. Not only are these sentiments and notions eating like a cancer into the heart of society and the industrial world, but they are even reaching into the domain of the church, invading the sanctuary and laying hold upon the very horns of the altar. [Applause.]

I noticed in one of the metropolitan papers not many months ago that one of the fashionable churches in New York City had adopted a rule that at each Sunday evening service all the worshipers must appear in full evening dress.

At the congress of religions held in Buffalo during the Pan-American Exposition a divine of the city of Chicago said:

I believe in dancing and card playing; I would turn the church vestry, if I had no other place, into a hall for dancing. I'd have billiard and pool tables, and I'd have card playing under the auspices of the church.

And, no doubt, in a short time we will hear from some other exponent of modern religion that a saloon in the basement and a poker table in the attic are valuable adjuncts to a modern church.

Some of the so-called "evangelists," with their sensational methods, would find a more fitting place on the stage of a cheap vaudeville theater than in a pulpit in a house of worship.

I am sincerely glad that in the rural districts less of these tendencies and influences exist than anywhere else. I am glad that there at least the old simplicity and the old-time virtue that gave strength and vigor to our fathers and our mothers are yet honored and are not forgotten; that the old songs and the old religion and the old faith are not yet relegated to the realms of superstition; and if our nation is to endure and our institutions be handed down unimpaired to the coming generations, it is from these sources that our national vigor and our industrial strength must be fed and nourished. It has been and will ever be from these sources that the great, brawny, sturdy, independent individualities who leave their mark upon the nation and upon the history of the world will come, those who will stand as the sentinels upon the watch-towers of human liberty and whose influences will be felt in shaping the destinies of the nation, the men whose lives will mark the milestones in the pathway by which the human race advances to higher planes of life.

The hope of the nation and of society and of religion lies in the vigor and the honor and the purity and the virtue of these great medial classes found largely in the rural population.

From scenes like these old Scotia's grandeur springs,
That makes her loved at home, revered abroad:
Princes and lords are but the breath of kings,
"An honest man's the noblest work of God."

This is largely the condition, thank God, in the district which I have the honor to represent. Down in the beautiful Missouri Ozarks, where "Dad" and "Mam," and John and Bill, and Sis and Ann meet around the family hearthstone, away from the blighting influences of modern social conditions; away from the hypocrisy and snobbery of modern society, worshiping the God of their fathers, revering the Sabbath Day; physically, morally, and intellectually the equals of any people on God's footstool; every woman a queen; every man a king; bubbling over with sturdy, robust manhood, ready to fight and to die for his family, his honor, his religion, and his country; enjoying happiness in this world and assured of happiness in the world to come.

I have read of the wonder of the ancient world, the hanging gardens of Babylon, which Nebuchadnezzar reared in graceful terraces high above the brazen gates of the city, to remind his Median wife of her mountain home, and I have read in the Odyssey of that land of delight, the island of the lotos-eaters, of which Tennyson draws this beautiful picture:

How sweet it were, hearing the downward stream, with half-shut eyes, to ever seem, falling asleep in a half dream.

But certainly the garden spot of the modern world is in the Mississippi Valley, with its sun-kissed mountains and broad rolling prairies. The paradise of the twentieth century civilization, there in our magnificent, fertile, and majestic Missouri, with her blue sky, her pellucid streams, her balmy air, her gorgeous sunsets, and her everlasting hills. We may visit the famed galleries of the world, and feast our æsthetic tastes upon the masterpieces of Raphael, Rembrandt, and Angelo, Reynolds, and Vandyke, but no painter's brush ever has, or ever can, produce on canvas half the glory and majesty and sublimity of an autumn sunset in the Ozark Hills, with the golden sunlight gilding the tree tops and throwing over and about the variegated foliage its soft and mellow radiance. [Applause.]

Beethoven and Mozart, Mendelssohn and Handel and Wagner have poured forth a flood of melody and harmony which will delight the ears of mankind while civilization lasts, but it can never inspire that feeling of buoyancy and exhilaration, that bubbling joy and gladness which is felt by the barefoot boy as he listens to the morning song of the mocking bird, the robin, and the lark as they flit from limb to limb, while the sunlight glistens on the dew, and the very air he breathes is full of life and gladness. [Applause.]

It is inspiring to know that the great apostle of the Democratic party, he whose name is already inscribed in the hearts of his followers and will be inscribed on our banner in the coming campaign, is an example of all these Christian virtues; is an apostle of a pure life and the believer in a clean literature, an advocate of the old-fashioned home; and it is these virtues and graces, added to his being an exponent of the great economic questions for which his party and the common people stand, that has endeared him to a greater number of American citizens than perhaps any other one man in the history of the country; which has made him the nominee of his party twice and given him the largest popular vote ever received by a Presidential candidate in the United States, and which will again make him the nominee of his party, and will elect him the President of his country and land him in the White House in 1909 a Christian President of a Christian nation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TOU VELLE].

Mr. TOU VELLE. Mr. Chairman, one of the characteristics of our civilization is its tendency to honor those who have borne arms in its defense—to build monuments to the men who have gone gallantly to death in their devotion to duty and the higher calls of the soul.

England has planted a triumphal stone on the blood-stained field of Waterloo, while on Trafalgar square, London, an illustrious shaft shoots upward to the sky, an imperishable monument to British heroism, daring, and loyalty. Near Niagara Falls another monument greets the eye, reared to the memory of General Brock and the soldiers who fell at that spot in their contest with American arms. We find them in every civilized country, the monumental signatures of immortality—the tribute of the living to the immortal dead.

Nor have we as Americans been intentionally lax in our tributes of respect to our own immortal dead who were killed in our Revolutionary and other wars. We have built monuments at Saratoga and at Kings Mountain in memory of the brave men who dedicated their lives at these places, the two great turning points in our struggle for liberty. Monuments grace our fair land from one end to the other, attesting the heroism of our soldiers in the war of 1812, the Florida Indian wars, the Mexican war, and the great titanic struggle between the sections in 1861. Monuments at Bennington, Bunker Hill, Savannah, and elsewhere lend inspiration to the living by teaching us how our warriors died. No one can object to any of these, nor to all of them. Certainly to look upon them fills every truly American heart with patriotic pride.

It is a great pleasure for me to ask, not that we build fewer, but that we build more, and the number be made to include a spot which should never become a forgotten page in our history. I have introduced a bill to appropriate $35,000 for the erection of a monument to the illustrious dead who fell fighting on two occasions on the selfsame ground—on the spot which marks the scene of St. Clair's defeat and where afterwards Fort Recovery was erected and so gallantly defended—and in the opinion of every soldier and citizen this body will not only honor the brave men who died on these occasions, but also honor itself by voting for the appropriation I ask.

I come from a region once the home of the Indian to ask the Congress of the United States to build a monument to mark a spot made glorious and deathlessly magnificent by the heroism of the American soldiery in a great struggle which wrested Ohio and Indiana from the control of a savage foe and added their men, their soil, and their influence to the all-conquering power of American civilization. [Applause.]

Lest we forget the heroism of these men and the prize they won for American arms and glory, I beg to be excused for describing these almost forgotten battles, St. Clair's defeat and Wayne's victory, and for enumerating some of the almost forgotten dead.

The West was to be won for civilization, and in pursuance of this decree the Government, through President Washington, sent General St. Clair with two regiments of Regulars and a few Kentucky Militia to establish a military post at the Miami village at the junction of the St. Mary and St. Joseph rivers, now Fort Wayne, Ind., with intermediate points of communication between that point and Fort Washington, now Cincinnati, as a most effectual means of preventing hostilities on the part of the Indians.

After building Fort Hamilton and Fort Jefferson, on the 24th of October General St. Clair began his toilsome march north through the wilderness, cutting that immortal road which has been called "the great Indian trace," or "St. Clair's Wilderness road." On the 3d of November, with a small army of less than 1,500 men, he arrived at a plateau on the east bank of the Wabash River and went into camp. It was General St. Clair's intention to camp here until he could receive supplies and reenforcements. He made the tremendous mistake of not considering the moves of his cunning and bloodthirsty antagonists.

All through the night of the 3d of November the Kentucky Militia complained of "seeing and hearing things," things which to their frontier minds indicated Indian proximity, Indian signs, and Indian danger. So much did these mysterious signs impress them that notice was sent back to General Butler in the night, who held it so slightly and of so little importance as not even to report it to General St. Clair. At daybreak on the 4th of November, 1791, the Indians surprised St. Clair exactly as they had General Braddock forty years before. Two thousand Indians in ambush poured their deadly rifle balls into the ranks of the undisciplined militia, who, seeing no foe, yet beholding their comrades fall on every side, became demoralized and fled to the cover of the Regulars across the river. Brave Colonel Oldham, in a vain effort to rally them, went down to his death.

The Regulars sprang to their arms and fought like heroes against their unseen foes. It was an unequal struggle, however, and they were slowly reduced to the demoralized state of the militia. The Indians had been gathering in great force for weeks on the Miami and Wabash rivers, and combined the fighting braves of the Wyandottes, the Miamis, the Shawnees, Ottawas, Sacs, Foxes, Pottawatomies, and many others from distant Lake Superior. They were commanded by the great chiefs, Little Turtle, Blue Jacket, and Black Eagle, to say nothing of the renegades, Girty and Blackstaffe.

From every side they poured volley after volley into the American ranks, but from no point of the compass was an Indian to be seen. General Butler ordered the cannon to be fired, which was done. Cannon balls crashed through the forest, mowing down trees and scattering undergrowth, without injury to the Indians. The thunderous echoes of the discharge came back upon the ears of our soldiers, coupled with the mocking shouts of the savages, who, from some other point, yelled defiance. The black smoke rose and fell, but the gunners, like the riflemen, saw no target.

Cavalrymen sprang upon their horses and galloped into the woods, but the fire from behind logs and trees soon emptied the saddles, with no one able to see where the firing came from. Regular troops, with cannon in the center and on the flanks, reckless of death, charged among the trees; the warriors melted away before them, and lo, no foe was there! When they fell back upon the mass of the army, however, the Indians swarmed again on every side, their bullets striking on human bodies like the pattering of raindrops on the water.

"Oh, God," groaned a Regular, "If I could only see a single enemy, see something to shoot at," and the next instant that Regular fell dead, shot by a hidden foe.

General Butler was wounded, and General St. Clair, just off a sick couch, was everywhere present rallying his men. Artillery horses were shot down, the groans of the wounded animals being the most pathetic sounds heard on the battlefield. Officers fell like sheep in the shambles, their bravery and epaulets furnishing targets for the savage foe. Step by step the army was driven more and more to the center, steadily down to defeat.

A ball striking General Butler in the side, he fell. Two soldiers carried him to a great heap of knapsacks and propped him up, well knowing that he had met his fate. A savage chief, the great Hoyoquim, the Black Eagle of the Wyandottes, sprang to General Butler's side and with one swift tomahawk stroke clove the General's head to the neck and then quickly escaped to cover. The dead dozens at first became scores and then hundreds. Every one of the Regular officers were killed or wounded. Still the men fought on without officers, fighting bravely for their lives. But the battle was lost beyond all saving, and with over half the army dead or wounded the bugle call for retreat was sounded.

Back over the "Wilderness road" went the fugitives, hard pressed at every step by their victorious foes. The savages knew they had destroyed one-half of the American army, and now redoubled their efforts to destroy the other half. The more experienced frontiersmen shouted, "Every man to his gun and every man to a tree!" and for 5 miles these tactics were employed by our retreating soldiers, until at last the savages gave up the pursuit.

A sad day was that! Gen. Richard Butler dead; Colonel Oldham dead; 3 majors, Ferguson, Hart, and Clark, dead; 12 captains, Bradford Phelan, Kirkwood, Price, Van Swearingen, Tipton, Purdy, Smith, Piatt, Gaither, Crebbs, and Newman, called to their long home; 10 lieutenants, Spear, Warren, Boyd, McMath, Burgess, Kelso, Read, Little, Hopper, and Likens, summoned to their eternal rest; 8 ensigns, Cobb, Balch, Chase, Turner, Wilson, Brooks, Beatty, and Purdy, down to rise no more; 2 quartermasters, 2 adjutants, and 23 other officers, besides 630 American soldiers, had paid the full measure of devotion to their country, and their fate was the Indian tomahawk and scalping knife and their remains left to bleach and rot on that ill-fated battlefield.

If fame is the fragrance of heroic deeds, then are these men entitled to the rewards of fame and a grateful country should hasten to pay the debt it owes. Cicero called gratitude the mother of all virtues, and a virtuous and grateful country can not longer wait to show its affection and reverence for these illustrious men. [Applause.] Gratitude is not only the memory we carry in mind, but the homage of the heart speaking in befitting monuments. An earthly immortality belongs to every brave soldier, and he is entitled to be embalmed with the monuments of his country.

Something more than two years later Gen. Anthony Wayne with his conquering legion recaptured this old battle ground, and on the spot where General St. Clair was defeated erected a double log fort, which, in honor of the event, he named "Fort Recovery." Somewhat later, in 1794, another battle was fought at Fort Recovery, continuing for two days, in which Major McMahon, Captain Hartshorn, Lieutenant Craig, and 19 other officers and 120 soldiers laid down their lives in a victorious defense of the old fort against almost overwhelming odds.

On September 10, 1851, on a day never to be forgotten, 5,000 citizens of this country gathered at Fort Recovery to honor these illustrious dead by a reinterment of their bones.

These citizens provided thirteen gigantic coffins for the reception of the bones. Thirteen caskets! What a remarkable number! The men who once animated these bones were from every State in the Union. These men came from each of the thirteen old Colonies, the magnificent forerunners of the original thirteen States. These heroes had fought for the independence of the Colonies and were citizens of the thirteen States. As ragged Continental soldiers they had upheld the doctrine of American freedom against British aggression and had emerged from that splendid struggle as victorious soldiers of a new-born nation.

They had seen service with Washington, and Greene, and Marion, and were led at the time of their death by the great Revolutionary generals, St. Clair, Butler, and Wayne. These bones, in the aggregate, represented the Continental soldiery of every colony from Massachusetts to Georgia, and in their totality represented the proud glories of Bunker Hill, of Saratoga, Princeton, Trenton, Kings Mountain, Camden, and Yorktown. These were the bones of an illustrious phalanx of Revolutionary heroes, and it was singularly appropriate that thirteen caskets, representing the glorious old thirteen colonies for which they fought in their younger days, and the thirteen States, constituting the latest-born nation of the earth, for which they laid down their lives, should be selected to hold their remains. The assembled bones of these soldiers required caskets of great size and 104 pallbearers for their manipulation. Gen. James Watson Riley directed the ceremonies, and a procession more than a mile in length accompanied the caskets to their last resting place in the graves on the very ground made famous by their death.

It is our supreme duty to preserve the liberties and the institutions for which these heroes laid down their lives. We enjoy these gifts as an inheritance won for us by these illustrious fathers. Living, these patriots were animated by a single purpose; the cause of one was the cause of all.

"In this harmony and unity is crystallized all the poetry and beauty, not only of nationality, but also of social unity and personal brotherhood. Let the youth of to-day be taught to properly appreciate the privileges they enjoy; let them be impressed with the sacrifices these institutions cost; and above all, let them be taught the true principles of government, and the future of our land will be most triumphantly assured." The monuments we rear to our soldier dead are milestones of educative progress for our youth, pointing them to the deeds of their fathers and exhorting them to follow in their illustrious steps. Let them meet arches and memorial shafts everywhere, in order that the fire of patriotism may not be dimmed in their hearts, nor the great American love of country go out forever. [Applause.]

Looking outward across the beautiful Potomac you see spread before you America's magnificent resting place for its illustrious dead—the Arlington of American patriotism and devotion. From the triumphal shafts which mark the graves of the officers we turn aside to look upon the resting place of an army of private soldiers. Beneath the grand old trees these white stones glisten, not so grand and stately, but none the less sacred to the American people.

All honor to Arlington and still greater honor to the sentiment which makes Arlington great.

"They gave their honors to the world,
Their blessed part to heaven,
And sleep in peace."

But is that enough? Shall these deathless heroes be covered with the trappings of glory while the heroes of Fort Recovery rest in the ashes of oblivion and sleep on forever in unmarked graves? Has the devotion which created Arlington fled from the minds of men? Are we as a nation exhausted by the tremendous accomplishments of our past and thereby excluded from further anticipation in deeds of honor and devotion for the future? Has the soul fire of love burned to the socket, reducing future Arlingtons and future monuments to the level of sentimentality? Do we acknowledge ourselves surpassed in deeds of love and sit down to recount our departed glory and strength? God forbid such a fate. Let us hope that what we have done is but the beginning of what we will yet do in the future to prove our appreciation of our heroic dead.

We are a great, a rich, a most powerful nation, with an influence that makes itself felt in every part of the habitable globe. We spend millions of dollars on hundreds of objects to maintain our proud position among the peoples of the earth. Shall we hesitate to spend a few thousand dollars on a monument for our soldier dead? Are we too poor to honor the graves of men who died that our greatness and wealth might be increased a hundred, yes, a thousand fold? What are $35,000 compared with the heroism, the sacrifice, the self-abnegation, and the memory of this immortal thousand that sleep in oblivion on the battle ground of St. Clair's defeat, and the selfsame battle ground of Wayne's decisive triumph? Shall we save money at the expense of our gratitude, at the expense of our devotion, at the expense of all our higher and nobler parts? Shall we forget the dead in order to save our gains? Is the great home in the American hearts not large enough to admit to honorable place the memory of the thousand Revolutionary soldiers that sleep at Fort Recovery, forgotten for more than one hundred years? Of the millions we spent on the Army, the Navy, the Philippines, the Panama Canal, and other worthy objects, can not a crumb be dropped to honor the memory of dead like the illustrious dead at Fort Recovery?

One of our great American poets has said:

And does Columbia love her dead?
No word of praise or honor can be said,
No language has been given to our race,
No monument has majesty or grace,
Naught that can feeling to expression wed,
May say how well we love our soldier dead.

Are these words but flowers of our language gathered into a beautiful bouquet and used by soldiers and citizens on Decoration Days merely, or are they the outpouring of the soul binding us by action and gratitude to heroes we praise and revere? The tenderest and best words become anchors of hope and levers of power when they impel us to proclaim by act and deed a sentiment of devotion for the dead—a sentiment which should nestle proudly and securely in its rightful home, the heart of the true American. [Applause.]

Monuments elongate the memories of heroes and emphasize their transcendent virtues. They are, in fact, beacons planted on the grave of virtue pointing proudly to heaven. Great deeds shall live on and on forever, and this monumental shaft of love insures their perpetuity.

I do not ask for much. My bill calls for a pittance, and a miserable pittance at that. Soldiers who walk boldly into battle for their country and are carried out of it deserve a register greater than the weeds of oblivion, for they loved their country's good more than they loved their lives. They were armed sentinels, guarding liberty, innocence, and right, and deserve the tribute I ask. To honor these men is our present duty, and every duty we omit obscures some truth. Truths are the clothes of the dead, and we shall but pay a tardy debt when we proclaim by the monument that we shall build the truths concerning the heroes of Fort Recovery. [Applause.]

It is to the everlasting credit of the late Senator Hanna, one of Ohio's great statesmen, that he felt the force of this demand. Before his death he introduced a bill having for its object to the very thing that I am asking now.

Mr. Chairman, every man sleeping in these unmarked graves was an American—a hero—every one of them contributed an undying part to the winning of the West; many of them were soldiers of the Revolutionary war—men who, from 1776 to 1783, fought to create the country, at whose after call they gave their lives in 1791 or 1794. They dared the death call of the haughty English foe in our war for independence; they dared the wilderness of the West and died on a field of splendid glory. That field, baptized by tears and dedicated in the blood of our fathers, should be sacred to every American heart and marked by a monument as indestructible as the cause for which they died, and the Government of the United States will not have given these soldiers their just measure of reward until it marks their graves and the ground on which they fell with an imperishable shaft, carrying their memory onward and outward to endless time. [Applause.] Erect it, Mr. Chairman, on the spot where the ashes of these heroes now rest; where they were reinterred with military honors one hundred years after General St. Clair's defeat, and let our country receive the blessings that are bestowed upon the just.

[Senate Report No. 1175. Fifty-eighth Congress, second session.]

For the erection of a memorial structure at Fort Recovery, Ohio.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to erect a suitable memorial structure on the grounds at Fort Recovery, Ohio, where lie buried the remains of Gen. Richard Butler, 630 American soldiers, and 61 officers, who, while under the command of General St. Clair, were slaughtered by the Indians of the Northwest Territory at the battle of Fort Recovery, Ohio, on the morning of November 4, 1791.

SEC. 2. That for the above purpose the sum of $25,000, or as much of said sum as may be necessary, be hereby appropriated, from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. This sum shall be expended by direction of the Secretary of War or such officers as he may designate: *Provided*, That the money hereby appropriated shall be drawn from time to time only as may be required during the progress of the work and under the requisition of the Secretary.

They report the same favorably, with an amendment.

On page 1, line 4, after the word "memorial," strike out the word "structure" and insert in lieu thereof the word "monument."

As amended it is recommended that the bill do pass.

The proposed legislation has for its purpose the suitable marking of the burial place of Gen. Richard Butler, 61 other officers, and about 630 American soldiers who were slaughtered by the Indians at Fort Recovery, Ohio, while under the command of Gen. Arthur St. Clair.

The battle occurred on November 4, 1791, but the killed were not buried until the following January, at which time a detachment of 150 Kentucky volunteers, under the command of Gen. James Wilkinson, was sent to perform that duty.

The following extracts from The Winning of the West (vol. 4) fully set forth the great disadvantage under which the Americans were compelled to conduct hostilities:

"On November 3 the doomed army, now reduced to a total of about 1,400 men, camped on the eastern fork of the Wabash, high up, where it was but 20 yards wide. There was snow on the ground and the little pools were skimmed with ice. The camp was on a narrow rise of ground where the troops were cramped together, the artillery and most of the horses in the middle. On both flanks, and along most of the rear, the ground was low and wet. All around the wintry woods lay in frozen silence. In front the militia were thrown across the creek and nearly a quarter of a mile beyond the rest of the troops. Parties of Indians were seen during the afternoon, and they skulked around the lines at night, so that the sentinels frequently fired at them. * * *

"On November 4 the men were under arms, as usual, by dawn, St. Clair intending to throw up entrenchments and then make a forced march in light order against the Indian towns. But he was forestalled. Soon after sunrise, just as the men were dismissed from parade, a sudden assault was made upon the militia, who lay unprotected beyond the creek. The unexpectedness and fury of the onset, the heavy firing, and the appalling whoops and yells of the throngs of painted savages threw the militia into disorder. After a few moments' resistance they broke and fled in wild panic to the camp of the Regulars, among whom they drove in a frightened herd, spreading dismay and confusion.

"The drums beat and the troops sprang to arms as soon as they heard the heavy firing at the front; and their volleys for a moment checked the onrush of the plumed woodland warriors. But the check availed nothing. The braves filed off to one side and the other, completely surrounded the camp, killed or drove in the guards and pickets, and then advanced close to the main lines.

"A furious battle followed. After the first onset the Indians fought in silence, no sound coming from them save the incessant rattle of their fire, as they crept from log to log, from tree to tree, ever closer and closer. The soldiers stood in close order, in the open; their musketry and artillery fire made a tremendous noise, but did little damage to a foe they could hardly see. Now and then, through the hanging smoke, terrible figures flitted, painted black and red, the feathers of the hawk and eagle braided in their long scalp-locks; but save for these glimpses the soldiers knew the presence of their somber enemy only from the fearful rapidity with which their comrades fell dead and wounded in the ranks. They never even knew the members or leaders of the Indians. * * * It is said that the chief who led them, both in council and in battle, was Little Turtle, the Miami. At any rate, there were present all the chiefs and picked warriors of the Delawares, Shawnees, Wyandots, and Miamis, and all the most reckless and adventurous young braves from among the Iroquois and the Indians of the Upper Lakes, as well as many of the ferocious whites and half-breeds who dwelt in the Indian villages.

"The Indians fought with the utmost boldness and ferocity, and with the utmost skill and caution. Under cover of the smoke of a heavy but harmless fire from the army they came up so close that they shot the troops down as hunters slaughter a herd of standing buffalo. Watching their chance, they charged again and again with the tomahawk, gliding into close quarters, while their bewildered foes were still blindly firing into the smoke-shrouded woods. The men saw no enemy as they stood in the ranks to load and shoot. In a moment, without warning, dark faces frowned through the haze, the war axes gleamed, and on the frozen ground the weapons clattered as the soldiers fell. As the comrades of the fallen sprang forward to avenge them the lithe warriors vanished as rapidly as they had appeared, and once more the soldiers

saw before them only the dim forest and shifting smoke wreaths, with vague half glimpses of the hidden foe, while the steady singing of the Indian bullets never ceased, and on every hand the bravest and steadiest fell one by one. * * *

"Instead of being awed by the bellowing artillery, the Indians made the gunners a special object of attack. Man after man was picked off until every officer was killed but one, who was wounded, and most of the privates also were slain or disabled. The artillery was thus almost silenced, and the Indians, emboldened by success, swarmed forward and seized the guns, while at the same time a part of the left wing of the army began to shrink back. But the Indians were now on comparatively open ground, where the Regulars could see them and get at them, and under St. Clair's own leadership the troops rushed fiercely at the savages with fixed bayonets and drove them back to cover. By this time the confusion and disorder were great, while from every hollow and grass patch, from behind every stump and tree and fallen log the Indians continued their fire. Again and again the officers led forward the troops in bayonet charges, and at first the men followed them with a will. Each charge seemed for a moment to be successful, the Indians rising in swarms and running in headlong flight from the bayonets. In one of the earliest, in which Colonel Darke led his battalion, the Indians were driven several hundred yards, across the branch of the Wabash; but when the colonel halted and rallied his men he found that the savages had closed in behind him, and he had to fight his way back, while the foe he had been driving at once turned and harassed his rear. He was himself wounded and lost most of his command. On reentering camp he found the Indians again in possession of the artillery and baggage, from which they were again driven; they had already scalped the slain who lay about the guns. Maj. Thomas Butler had his thigh broken by a bullet, but he continued on horseback in command of his battalion until the end of the fight, and led his men in one of the momentarily successful bayonet charges. The only Regular regiment present lost every officer killed or wounded. The commander of the Kentucky Militia, Colonel Oldham, was killed early in the action, while trying to rally his men and damning them for cowards.

"The charging troops could accomplish nothing permanent. The men were too clumsy and ill trained in forest warfare to overtake their fleet, half-naked antagonists. The latter never received the shock; but though they fled they were nothing daunted, for they turned the instant the battalion did and followed firing. They skipped out of reach of the bayonets and came back as they pleased, and they were only visible when raised by a charge. * * *

"As the officers fell the soldiers, who at first stood up bravely enough, gradually grew disheartened. No words can paint the hopelessness and horror of such a struggle as that in which they were engaged. They were hemmed in by foes who showed no mercy and whose blows they could in no way return. If they charged, they could not overtake the Indians, and the instant the charge stopped the Indians came back. If they stood, they were shot down by an unseen enemy; and there was no stronghold, no refuge, to which to flee.

"The Indian attack was relentless and could neither be avoided, parried, nor met by counter assault. For two hours or so the troops kept up a slowly lessening resistance, but by degrees their hearts failed. The wounded had been brought toward the middle of the lines, where the baggage and tents were, and an ever-growing proportion of unwounded men joined them. In vain the officers tried by encouragement, by jeers, by blows, to drive them back to the fight. They were unnerved. * * *

"There was but one thing to do. If possible, the remnant of the army must be saved, and it could only be saved by instant flight, even at the cost of abandoning the wounded. The broad road by which the army had advanced was the only line of retreat. The artillery had already been spiked and abandoned. Most of the horses had been killed, but a few were still left, and on one of these St. Clair mounted. He gathered together those fragments of the different battalions which contained the few men who still kept heart and head and ordered them to charge and regain the road from which the savages had cut them off. Repeated orders were necessary before some of the men could be roused from their stupor sufficiently to follow the charging party, and they were only induced to move when told that it was to retreat.

"Colonel Darke and a few officers placed themselves at the head of the column, the coolest and boldest men drew up behind them, and they fell on the Indians with such fury as to force them back well beyond the road. This made an opening through which * * * the troops 'pressed like a drove of bullocks.' The Indians were surprised by the vigor of the charge and puzzled as to its object. They opened out on both sides and half the men had gone through before they fired more than a chance shot or two. They then fell on the rear and began a hot pursuit. St. Clair sent his aid, Denny, to the front to try to keep order, but neither he nor anyone else could check the flight. Major Clark tried to rally his battalion to cover the retreat, but he was killed and the effort abandoned. * * *

"Six hundred and thirty men had been killed and over 280 wounded; less than 500, only about a third of the whole number engaged in battle, remained unhurt. But one or two were taken prisoners, for the Indians butchered everybody, wounded or unwounded, who fell into their hands. * * *

"In the following January Wilkinson, with 150 mounted volunteers, marched to the battlefield to bury the slain. The weather was bitterly cold, snow lay deep on the ground, and some of the volunteers were frost-bitten. Four miles from the scene of battle, where the pursuit had ended, they began to find the bodies on the road and close alongside in the woods, whither some of the hunted creatures had turned at the last to snatch one more moment of life. Many had been dragged from under the snow and devoured by wolves. The others lay where they had fallen, showing as mounds through the smooth, white mantle that covered them. On the battlefield itself the slain lay thick, scalped, and stripped of all their clothing which the conquerors deemed worth taking. The bodies, blackened by frost and exposure, could not be identified, and they were buried in a shallow trench in the frozen ground. The volunteers then marched home.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, during the last few years I have several times introduced bills having for their object changes in the tariff and making modifications with reference to duties which it seemed to me were especially objectionable and especially defenseless. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that in these measures I can not flatter myself that I have received a very large degree of encouragement from the majority of my associates. I have sometimes felt that a bill seeking to modify the tariff, in the Committee on Ways and Means as now constituted, had about the same prospect of a favorable report as a bill imposing a severe penalty on bigamy would have if introduced into a Congress composed of Mormons. [Laughter.] But, Mr. Chairman, I have persevered, and in the present Congress introduced a bill having for its object taking off the duties on lumber of any sort, on print paper, wood pulp, and works of art. I have felt a certain degree of encouragement because the President of the United States has very recently called the attention of Congress and the country to at least one portion of the measure covered by that bill, and that is the duty on print paper and wood pulp.

Now, the President of the United States, Mr. Chairman, as we all know, has long been in sympathy with the cause of tariff reform and tariff revision, and yet I must admit that in that cause he has not shown all the zeal and the ardor which he has displayed in some matters to which he has turned his attention. [Laughter.]

He has proceeded in the attack upon the bulwarks with a certain degree of calm deliberation that has not always been characteristic of him as a commander. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I find no fault. I recognize the fact that introducing a bill by a Republican Member to modify the tariff may be compared to the man that takes part in the charge of a forlorn hope; the forlorn hope is a proper place for the private; the private can go on, and if he loses his life no great harm be done. The commander, on the other hand, the general in chief, judiciously turns his attention to the enterprise in which the probability of success is greater and the possibility of danger is somewhat less.

I desire to say a word about the duty on works of art. This really stands in a very peculiar position. I have never found anyone who either wanted the duty or defended it. Our own artists do not want it. They are eager for its repeal. All patrons of arts, all public institutions, all good citizens join in reprobating it.

It is not required as a productive duty, and yet only as this is it sought to be defended. The richest government in the world, with a surplus on hand of hundreds of millions, certainly does not have to eke out its income by imposing a duty on works of art. We had far better pay a bounty for their introduction than impose a duty that tends to check their purchase.

It is said that this duty is imposed only upon private purchasers and not upon purchases made for public museums. But most of the art wealth, which becomes the property of the public, comes indirectly from private collectors. Rich men buy works of art and enjoy them in their own lifetime, but a large portion of them are finally given to the public. The public galleries are not rich. They must depend upon private generosity if they are ever to obtain large stores of artistic value.

Even so far as works of art remain private property, they furnish pleasure of a high order; they educate, they elevate. A tax on them, together with a tax on books, would seem to be the most ill-advised imposition that a so-called "enlightened government," could impose; and, moreover, the beautiful things which educate the taste of the few sooner or later become the property of the nation. Then they educate the taste; they refine the manners; they add to the happiness of all.

The great art treasures of the Louvre and of the British national gallery would not have been accumulated for the instruction and delight of their nations and of all nations, if taxes had been imposed checking the introduction of works of art into those countries. It has been reserved for our own Congress to select a method of taxation which was never resorted to even by the most stupid of Bourbon kings or the most wrongheaded of Stuart sovereigns. For these many long years this provision has stood on our statute book unhonored, undefended, unrepealed.

Mr. Chairman, the duty on lumber has always seemed to me a strange one to have been imposed, and a still stranger one so long to have continued, because the diminution of our forests is an evil recognized by all. The Forester, Mr. Pinchot, tells us that in twenty or twenty-five years at the present rate of consumption the forests of this country will be largely a thing of the past, a result fraught with untold evil. On the one hand we are spending millions of dollars, and I think spending them wisely, in acquiring a national domain by means of which our forests may be preserved, the supply of our rivers may be continued, the possibility of countless thousands and hundreds of thousands of acres becoming useless may be averted; and on the other hand, when it comes to the consumption of lumber, when it comes to allowing the growing evil to be averted by

the introduction of foreign lumber, we continue to impose a duty upon it.

It is, Mr. Chairman, a thing of more than questionable wisdom. There is another thing to be considered which, in reference to the question of lumber, has always struck me as peculiarly unfortunate. Who are the people upon whom any increase in the price of lumber falls? There is no increase in cost, except possibly an increase in the cost of what is eaten, that falls upon so large a class. Every man who builds a frame house has to pay more if the price of lumber is higher. Every man that puts up a fence around his farm has to pay more if the price of lumber is higher. When it comes to the profits, to those who gain by the imposition of the duty, a thing that always, of course, we should carefully consider, I doubt if there is any great commodity in the country which is in the hands of so small a number of people. A few great corporations, a few multimillionaires, own the great bulk of the timber land of the United States, and so any duty which has for its result to enhance the price of lumber brings an increased gain to a very small class and imposes an increased cost upon every man that lives who builds a wooden house and every man who burns a cord of wood.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me a duty little to be defended. Of course no one is so foolish as to say that the increase in the price of lumber is entirely caused by the duty, because the decrease in the forests, the diminution in the total amount of timber, is of course the great cause; but so far as we do anything by legislation to increase the cost by one dollar or one cent a cord, certainly to that extent it is injurious legislation. It would be wiser, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, with a view to preserving the timber of the country, with a view to lessening the price of wood that a man burns in his home and puts in the house that he erects to cover his family, to impose a bounty—if ever bounties were to be offered—on every stick of timber imported into this country from another land, rather than imposing a duty that, so far as it goes, tends to keep out lumber grown in other countries.

Mr. Chairman, I want in the very brief time I have to say a few words in reference to a corporation largely before the country—that is, the International Paper Company, which certainly has been a large consumer of our diminishing stock of wood, and has shown no readiness either to abate the price of the product which it sells or to open the markets more widely to the introduction of resources from other lands. The other day the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TIRRELL], a most genial and charming gentleman as we all know, gave us his views, based somewhat upon personal experience, in reference to the International Paper Company. He himself, it seems, is one of those who had to do with its formation, and I doubt not, and I sincerely hope, profited by its gains.

Mr. TIRRELL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to correct the statement just made by the gentleman. I had nothing whatever to do with the formation of the company.

Mr. PERKINS. At all events, I would like to say a few words in reference to the formation of this corporation, and some particulars of its history which I think are instructive as a part of our financial history. The price of paper years ago was high—the print paper that goes into the newspapers I mean by that. During a long period of years the price of print paper—the paper used for newspapers—tended downward, and that has been the history of many branches of great products. The price of steel rails, for instance, is very much lower than it was thirty or forty years ago. The improvements in manufacture, the improvements in material, the development of commerce and industry, tends, if nothing occurs to check its course, to lessen the price of most of the great manufactured products, and in reference to print paper there were special reasons. Formerly paper was largely made out of rags. Then ingenious persons discovered that paper could be made out of wood pulp. That worked a great diminution in the price. Improvements were made—the improvements that result in every great industry from the ingenuity of man—and as a result the price of paper used for newspapers tended downward.

Now, from that came certain results, partly beneficial, and some of them perhaps less beneficial. The beneficial one, which we will all confess, was the lowering in the price of newspapers. Everybody knows that in late years you can buy a paper for 1 cent or 2 cents, whereas thirty or forty years ago a 1-cent newspaper was a thing almost unknown. I do not know but that it was wholly unknown. That was made possible to a considerable extent by the lowering of the price of paper. There has been another result which, I am free to say, I regard as much less beneficial, because the newspapers which are sold to us of thirty or forty pages, especially on Sundays, have been made possible as commercial enterprises by the lowering of the price of print paper, and whether that is a blessing is a thing to be considered. But at all events the price of print paper tended downward, and that being the case, about ten years ago, in 1898, I think it was, the International Paper Company was organized.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not at all, as I am sure my associates in the House know, a person who rants in reference to great enterprises and talks about octopuses, but I think that we may examine, with profit to all, the history of some of them. The first thing that was done prior to the organization of the International Paper Company was to raise the duty. The duty on print paper at that time was $3, which was more than sufficient. It was more than was required to cover any difference in the price of labor between the labor of this country and the labor in Canada or in any other country, because, as a matter of fact, with a duty of $3 no print paper came into the country at all at that period. But, with a prudent regard for future development, the duty, which was already prohibitory, of $3 was raised to $6. Then the duty on wood pulp was raised about 33 per cent, from about $1.28 to about $1.67, and after those changes had been made the International Paper Company was organized.

Now, my friend from Massachusetts the other day, who alluded in such tender terms to its financial history and its career, did not furnish us all its statistics, although those which he did furnish were entirely correct. That company was organized with a capital and bonded indebtedness of about $50,000,000—bonds of about $10,000,000; preferred stock at 6 per cent, $22,000,000, and of common stock they issued about $18,000,000. Those are not the precise figures, but they are near enough, thus making a total capitalization of $50,000,000. My friend said: "Why complain of greed? They have not been able to pay a dividend on their capital of $50,000,000." And they have not; but it is for us to see, Mr. Chairman, what that capitalization represented, how far it represented value and how far it represented water—not water to be used in the manufacture of paper, but water used solely in the manufacture of stock.

Mr. LAMB. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. LAMB. Just for one question. I see you are talking from your shoulder, and I think now you would be ready to withdraw the point of order you made against the paragraph in the agricultural appropriation bill instructing the Secretary of Agriculture to find new materials for making paper.

Mr. PERKINS. My friend is wrong in his recollection. I did not make the point of order on the amendment as finally offered, that they should simply investigate and see out of what materials paper could be made. I did raise the point of order against their going into the paper business——

Mr. LAMB. Covering the very ground you are now arguing.

Mr. PERKINS. The International Paper Company was made up by a large number of mills. Some of them were good and some of them were bad. Some of them were worth a good deal and a good many were worth nothing, and the capitalization was produced by the process by which they were taken in. There was, for instance, one paper-mill company with a capital of $500,000, a prosperous company. There were issued to it of the securities of the International Paper Company, $2,250,000.

It was taken in at the very comfortable basis of 450. Another company had a capital stock of $500,000, a less prosperous company. It got in securities of the new company $2,000,000. There was another mill that, as those familiar with those things say, had not earned a dividend, and it was impossible to see how it should ever earn a dividend. It was taken in at $800,000, payable in securities. There were large mills and large paper properties in my own State of New York that had much to do with the organization. They were taken in at $8,000,000, and I have never met any man who said that anyone would have been foolish enough to buy them and pay for them in money $4,000,000. In addition to these plants and as illustrating the manner in which this organization was made, there were included in these purchases ninety-eight machines used for making paper. Now, of those machines it is said that more than fifty were old and practically had become obsolete by the progress of the art. But they were all purchased. There was one of the machines at one of the mills up in our own State which Mr. Warner Miller, one of the originators of this company, had worked on, it was said, when he was a boy.

It had, therefore, undoubtedly a great sentimental value to those who formed this corporation. It certainly had no other value, because for years and years its value as a practical machine had ceased. That was among the stock that was included in the property that was turned in to the International Paper Company. Those familiar with mills, and I have talked with

many of them, say that $15,000,000 would have been a fair estimate of the market value of all the mills and plants that were taken into this corporation. It had to earn, and it started to earn, on $50,000,000. My friend from Massachusetts says it has never paid dividends on its common stock. I must contradict my friend, or, rather, say that my friend is mistaken——

Mr. TIRRELL. I made the statement they had paid two dividends in the first two years of their organization, in 1898, but have not paid any since.

Mr. PERKINS. I can speak, Mr. Chairman, from a clear recollection, because I was myself, with a friend, a purchaser, and that is why, to some extent, I am fairly familiar with the International Paper Company. I was the owner of common stock only, unfortunately, instead of being an organizer and an insider like my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. TIRRELL]. I was an outsider to whom a certain amount of this common stock was sold. The $17,000,000 of common stock represented nothing in actual value, but it was divided around among those who put in their properties. Perhaps my friend got some. I do not know whether he did or not. If he did not, other organizers did. Of course I do not think the people in the company ever supposed it would be possible to pay the interest on $10,000,000 of bonds, dividends on $22,000,000 of preferred stock, and also on $17,000,000 of common stock. But it was perfectly possible to sell that to an eager public; and for that purpose, during two years, dividends at the rate of 4 per cent on the common stock were paid, and during that time I have no doubt that all the insiders, my friend included, disposed of their common stock with the greatest rapidity. [Laughter.]

There is a thing which we can always notice, Mr. Chairman, and that is when it comes to some specially profitable provision of any tariff law, to some specially possible combination of business interests, no party lines are drawn. Our friends the Democrats, quite as much as the Republicans, are glad to avail themselves of that opportunity and to reap the profits, and so in the International Paper Company one of the towers of strength in that corporation was Mr. Roswell P. Flower, who was, as we all know, a tower of strength in the Democratic party, a Democratic governor, a great financier down in Wall street and a great banker there. And I remember in connection with this modest investment that my friend and myself made in that common stock that it was selling at 40 to 50 and paying 4 per cent, and it looked nice. I saw an interview in the paper with Mr. Flower at one time where he called attention to the organization of the International Paper Company, wherein he told how cheaply they had gotten their plants, at what low prices they had acquired their property from my friend from Massachusetts and elsewhere, and as a result what future profits would inure, especially on the common stock, after paying the dividends on preferred with the profits of this organization.

I remember that, because on that statement, my friend and myself made our modest investment. A year or two after that, when the stock was selling at 20, when dividends had ceased—and they have ceased from that time to this time—Mr. Flower was called away to his fathers. I remember looking with interest at the inventory of his property, and we discovered that, among other assets, amounting altogether to many millions, there was just exactly, if I remember correctly, one share, worth $100, of the common stock of the International Paper Company. [Laughter.] The stock we bought, I presume, was supplied to us by Mr. Flower or other insiders out of a benevolent desire to let the public into a good thing. I have seen, Mr. Chairman, that four of those who were largely instrumental in the formation of the International Paper Company, died leaving fortunes in excess of $1,000,000, and at such results I am not surprised. Well, now, about the profits, and this illustrates the possibility of profits in our great land, because it was made not only from dividends on the large volume of preferred stock but the $17,000,000 of common stock, which was sold at an average of 40 per cent, was disposed of to the public while dividends were being paid, so that would be called a by-product of this corporation [laughter], and that would yield a profit of $7,000,000, which is not to be despised. [Laughter.]

So the company was launched; it was badly launched, because it had a great number of plants, some of them of very small value, bought at a high price, and it was a badly managed business. Formerly active competition from all the world stimulated activity. The manufacture of paper improved, and the price of paper lessened. As a result of changes in the tariff the possibility of competition from any other country was shut off. It was claimed that in having all of the plants, or a large proportion of the plants, gathered in one whole, there would be great economy and great reform. It has not been made. It is no doubt true they are making more paper than ever, but the fact is that they have not secured economy in making it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Just let me finish this one sentence. These economies were made. It is stated that the salary of the president of the new corporation was fixed at $50,000—a very favorite form of economy. The department managers, who have been receiving $7,500, went into the new company at salaries of $15,000. Such economies blossomed in the International Paper Company, but there were no others. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PERKINS. It does not seem to me that such a development of American industry needs the interposition of the Government to increase its gains. The price of paper has been increased, and whether we attribute this to the tariff, which operates to the extent of $6 per ton, or to the increase in the price of lumber that results in part from the fact that we shut out foreign lumber and wood pulp, this affects injuriously the newspapers of the land.

If we consider the interests of labor, the newspapers employ forty men to one employed by the manufacturer of print paper. This business, in addition, is one of the most rapid agents in the depletion of our forests. Every year, so the Government Forester tells us, the trees that are cut off in this country to be ground up into wood pulp would cover an area almost as large as the State of Rhode Island. Here also, it seems to me, it would be wiser to pay a bonus on the wood pulp that could be brought in from other countries, and thus save our own forests, than to impose a tariff to keep it out.

I remember seeing that proceedings were to be taken a year or two ago for the dissolution of the International Paper Company. I believe that proceedings are not actually commenced, and it is of very little importance whether they are or not. Love laughs at the locksmith, and the trusts can well laugh at the Attorney-General. In so far as such combinations are the results of business conditions, they will not be put an end to by all the attorneys-general in the world. Fines can be imposed for a violation of the provisions of law, and in such a case as that of the Standard Oil Company they can be so severe as to be serious and, against a weaker combination, destructive; but where a combination of capital naturally results from business conditions, its dissolution will merely mean a new combination, with such changes as may be required to evade the decision. If I am right, the Standard Oil Company in some of its forms has been dissolved by decrees of the court; but while the joint ownership of the property remains, the joint action is sure to go on in some other form.

To no branch of public activity has more attention been given. In no department has there been as ostentatious sounding of trumpets and beating of drums as in proceedings brought to dissolve combinations that were claimed to be contrary to law. I doubt if any branch of public activity has been less important to the public good.

The nation hung in suspense over the decision of the Northern Securities case. The success of the Government was loudly applauded by excited admirers, but the ownership of the railroads affected remained the same. The control has remained the same, except as it has been affected, not by legislation, but by voluntary transfer. If the conditions of railroad travelers or shippers of freight or any other business conditions in the Northwest have been affected by the decision of the court in the Northern Securities case I have yet to find out the fact. Apparently the only people affected were the stockholders. The quotations on their stock advanced enormously after the Government had obtained a legal victory that was supposed to check their illegal desire for undue gain.

The legislation that affects combinations is not found in suits to dissolve charters, which, if the ownership of the property continues the same, usually means only a new job for an astute lawyer in preparing a new charter. But, as these combinations are the outgrowth of conditions, so legislation that affects the conditions will surely affect them. The action to dissolve the International Paper Company, if successful, would mean only the formation of a new international paper company. An action was brought and resulted in the dissolution of a similar combination in the West. The gentleman from Nebraska told us that this resulted in the temporary lowering in the price he paid for his paper, but soon prices were restored, and he met with the same combination of interests that he had before. To adopt the language used by the trade, they soon found that the same parties in interest were carrying on business at the old

stand in the old way in a new shape. In forming any effective combination the restriction of the field is of infinite importance. It is very much easier to combine the interests of one country than it is the interests of all the world. I doubt if anyone thinks that the International Paper Company would have ever been formed if Congress ten years ago had not placed a duty of $6 on paper and $1.63 on wood pulp.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOSS. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKINLAY].

Mr. MCKINLAY of California. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to get an opportunity to say a few words in support of the general proposition of developing a large navy for the United States. But at the same time I want to say that I will be in favor of the recommendation of the minority, which is in favor of four battle ships instead of two. Perhaps it is because I represent a district which fronts for nearly 250 miles upon the Pacific Ocean and which has also 40 miles of bay front on the Bay of San Francisco, that I have given the subject of oriental trade and the prospect of American influence in the Orient special consideration.

In the district that I have the honor to represent there are a great many who are engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States and Alaska, and many others in trade with nations across the Pacific Ocean, and I believe it is the unanimous opinion on the part of those who are best qualified to form an opinion and express it, that the time has come when it is necessary that the Pacific Ocean shall have a squadron of battle ships and cruisers permanently stationed in her waters as strong as that which is maintained upon the Atlantic. It seems to me that there never was a time in the history of the nation when we were so fortuitously situated in regard to an opportunity to secure foreign trade and commerce as we are to-day. And I apply this remark particularly to the developing markets of the countries of Asia.

But I believe that the first element necessary to enable us to secure oriental trade and an output for our products to the lands of the East is to maintain a sufficient degree of naval strength upon the Pacific Ocean, not to invite war, but to guard against it. It will only be under a sense of security and protection against seizure and spoliation growing out of international complications that an American merchant marine will be developed that will furnish the means by which the products of the United States may be distributed throughout the countries surrounding the Pacific Ocean, in which we hope to obtain at some time an extensive market for American products.

In this connection I would like to call the attention of gentlemen to some of the present economic conditions of the United States. Within the last ten years the wealth of the United States has more than doubled. We have been told that in 1897 our national wealth approximated $65,000,000,000. The best statisticians of the country to-day tell us that our wealth is now in the neighborhood of $120,000,000,000. One gentleman on the other side in debate a few days ago fixed the wealth of the United States at $150,000,000,000. This sum, however, I believe to be in excess of the actual present sum total of our national wealth.

But, nevertheless, the accumulation of national wealth within the last ten years has been enormous and never paralleled in the history of any country of the world. This great accumulation of national wealth has multiplied the capital of the country, and out of this increased capital fund have come the necessary means to capitalize the great manufacturing plants of the United States, those industrial factors which have become the phenomena of our industrial development in the last decade. The great increase of national wealth has also placed at the command of enterprise the enormous wage fund necessary to be used in the payment of the army of workers employed in those industries. And the result is that in the wise cooperation of abundant capital and abundant labor the United States has developed her manufactures within the last ten years to such an extent that last year the industries of the nation produced nearly fifteen billions of manufactured products.

The output of the mills and factories of the country during the last year was supplemented by seven and one-half billions of dollars of farm products. To this must be added four or five billions of dollars of products from the mines and the forests. Now, the great proportion of all this output of the productive factors of the United States was consumed at home; but still nearly two billions of it were compelled to find a market abroad. Nearly eight hundred millions of manufactured products were compelled to secure an outside market. In the operation of the industrial systems of the United States, we to-day employ, directly and indirectly, over 15,000,000 wage-earners. Therefore it is most essential that our goods should find a market in order that our manufactures should remain in operation and our workers remain in steady employment. If our products are not sold at home to the limit of our producing capacity or the surplus can not find a market abroad, it means that month by month it will pile up unsold and have a most depressing influence upon industries at home, and ultimately cause their suspension of activity or actual cessation for a time at least. This means, of course, the loss of labor and the consequent loss of wages. Now, out on the Pacific Ocean there is a chance for the United States to avoid the possibility of a surplus product being accumulated in the United States for many years to come by simply seizing the present opportunity and quickly laying the foundation of a future trade with the nations bordering that great ocean.

Over in Asia is the future market of the world, but as yet America seems to be ignoring her possibilities in that quarter. Those who can see the trend of the world's development are beginning to realize at last that the prophecy of Baron von Humboldt, uttered in the year 1800, was a true prophecy, and that the predictions of Seward, uttered over forty years ago, are coming true—that the Pacific Ocean in its relation to the United States, in its relation to the commerce and trade of the world, will some day be the same to America as the Mediterranean was to the Empire of Rome, and that the seats of power of the greatest nations of the earth will be on the Pacific shores.

Around the shores of that ocean, in Asia and Australasia alone, are 823,000,000 of the peoples of the world. I am only giving you the figures from Australia, New Zealand, the French East Indies, British India, Japan, Korea, Persia, Siam, and China, and not speaking of the Philippine Islands or any of the countries along the American continent. Last year those countries imported $1,270,000,000 worth of products. Only $109,000,000 of this product came from the United States.

In this connection I desire to insert in the RECORD a tabulation of the territorial area, the population, the total imports and exports of those countries, and the proportion now secured by the United States. A study of this tabulation should show the unbounded possibilities of oriental trade and the necessity of maintaining a Pacific Ocean fleet adequate to foster and protect that trade.

The events which followed the victory at Manila and our occupation of the Philippine Islands have thrown us into a position in the Pacific Ocean which should, and I believe does, make us, even at this time, the dominating power of Asia. The attitude which our nation took toward China when the Boxer troubles were on in that country, when President McKinley and Secretary Hay held back the greedy hands of the nations of Europe who wished to dismember her—this attitude undoubtedly gave us a standing and a position of influence in China with her four hundred and thirty-odd millions of people that is

	Area.	Population.	Population per square mile.	Year.	Imports.	Imports from United States.	Exports.	Exports to United States.
Australia	2,972,573	4,048,000	1.36	1906	$217,676,000	$22,549,000	$322,648,000	$17,395,000
New Zealand	104,751	889,000	8.49	1905	62,432,000	7,000,000	76,190,000	3,486,000
French East Indies	461,196	18,346,000	39.78	1904	36,792,000		36,073,000	
British India	1,766,642	294,361,000	166.62	1906	334,379,000	7,276,000	513,186,000	42,203,000
China	4,277,176	433,533,000	101.36	1906	349,913,000	36,304,000	193,185,000	29,974,000
Japan	147,655	47,975,000	324.91	1906	208,554,000	34,834,000	211,030,000	62,730,000
Korea	84,000	12,000,000	142.18	1905	15,916,000	985,000	3,438,000	
Persia	628,000	7,654,000	12.19	1904-5	26,943,000	118,000	19,093,000	29,000
Siam	236,000	5,000,000	21.19	1905	17,404,000	277,000	29,043,000	
Estimated total	10,678,387	823,806,000			1,270,009,000	109,343,000	1,403,906,000	146,817,000

enjoyed by no other country of the world, and there is a growing disposition as a consequence on the part of China to trade and do business with the United States.

Again, in Japan there are over 47,000,000 people on a territory of only 140,000 square miles, but still our trade is growing with Japan despite the fears of many that we may have war with that Empire. And despite commercial rivalries growing out of commercial and industrial competition for oriental markets between ourselves and Japan, I believe that our trade will year by year expand in that quarter. So with India, Korea, and Australia our trade must necessarily and naturally increase as the years go on if we now are wise as a people seeking trade and commerce with the world and take proper means to secure our share. I believe the first step necessary is to as quickly as possible to build up a strong, up-to-date navy, a navy large enough to permit the sending of our ships to every port of the Orient, so in time of expected or unexpected danger they may give protection to American citizens and guarantee safety to American interests, and more especially insure to American shippers protection for their goods in American bottoms. A strong navy will be the sure forerunner of a much-desired merchant marine for the United States, which, I am sure, all Americans hope to some day see developed to such a magnitude that it will float our merchant flags upon not only the Pacific, but over all the seas of the world.

Why should America not be the dominating power of the Pacific Ocean? Turn to the map and follow the coast line 3,000 miles along the shores of America proper from Mexico to British Columbia. Then there is Alaska farther north, which ten years ago was counted an asset of little worth. Seward was laughed at forty years ago when he purchased Alaska for $7,200,000; but within the last ten years Alaska has produced $300,000,000 of wealth, which has been turned into the great sum total of the United States. And in Alaska we have untold riches yet undiscovered. That wonderful country has over 26,000 miles of coast line, a coast line which extends from Alaska proper along the Aleutian Island group until the last island almost touches the shores of Japan. On the other side of the Pacific is the Philippine Archipelago, that great group containing over 3,000 islands, 900 of which are inhabited, with a population of 8,000,000 people. The Philippine trade last year amounted to nearly $40,000,000, and yet we secured in the neighborhood of only $6,000,000.

Then toward the center of the Pacific Ocean are the Ladrones and the island of Guam, and between these islands and San Francisco lies the Hawaiian group, which last week only we decided to make the naval outpost of the United States by establishing there a naval station and fortifications that shall be adequate to protect our Pacific coast from the operations of any hostile fleet. To the south is the Canal Zone, a strip of land 10 miles wide extending from the Caribbean Sea to the Pacific Ocean through the Republic of Panama. These positions of strength and strategy from both a commercial and warlike standpoint give the United States the undoubted domination of the Pacific Ocean, and it compels us as a nation and a people to see to it that we maintain our prestige and advantage by quickly laying the foundations of trade and commerce throughout those islands by opening up channels of communication and transportation that shall carry the output of the mills and factories, looms, forges, and farms of the United States to the markets of the Orient and South America.

Therefore I feel it my duty to not only support the recommendations of the Naval Committee, but also to go further and support the minority of that committee in recommending that the number of battle ships provided for by this session of Congress shall be four instead of two. In doing this I am only indorsing the recommendations of the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Naval Board. Not only are these great authorities of the requirements of the Navy in accord in their recommendations for four battle ships, but Secretaries Root and Taft, and many other leading statesmen of the country who have given the subject of American supremacy in the Pacific Ocean consideration, are in favor of measures that shall undoubtedly develop the naval power in the Pacific Ocean until it shall be adequate to guard every interest of the Republic against any danger that may arise, even though the conflicting nations of Asia should enter into a contest for supremacy and dominion that should revolutionize the whole eastern world.

Mr. McKINLAY of California. Mr. Chairman, I desire leave to print an epitome of the trade of Asia, and also to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I object.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KÜSTERMANN].

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing I am so reluctant to do as to speak of myself, but in order to emphasize what I wish to say I am obliged to give you a part of my life's story.

My cradle stood on the other side of the ocean, and I was nearly of age when the thought struck me to try my fortune in the great country that from my earliest youth I had heard spoken of as offering the greatest opportunities to anyone who was willing to work, who had the necessary energy and a fair education, and who could not be persuaded to swerve from the path of honor, duty, and honesty.

On my arrival in New York my funds had so dwindled that I would not have been allowed to land had it been some years later, when those in favor of restricting immigration succeeded in having a law passed requiring every immigrant to have a certain amount of money in his possession.

Perhaps anticipating that such an unreasonable law might be enacted, aided by the ever alert Immigration Restriction League, I made haste, slipped through, and after a five days' trip on an emigrant train arrived in what I later on found to be one of the best States in the Union—the great State of Wisconsin.

The same good fortune that finally landed me in the Congress of the United States resulted in my securing a position only a few days after my arrival. My success was beyond my expectations, as a result of not being afraid to work and always trying to do my duty.

I learned to love my adopted land as dearly as anyone loved it whose cradle stood within the borders of the United States. [Applause.]

The Star-Spangled Banner—and may it ever remain the emblem of true liberty—has won my admiration, and I shall never cease to love those who stood by it and defended it in the dark hours of the rebellion.

The patriotism with which I had already become enthused when giving the United States the preference over my native land grew steadily as I learned the ways of this country, acquired full knowledge of its institutions, and studied its glorious history.

No one ever felt more proud of his American citizenship than I did when two years ago I visited Independence Hall and stood in the room in which, one hundred and thirty-one years ago, there assembled those great men who, with true courage and inspired by their patriotism, ready to accept the consequences of their deed, signed one of the grandest documents in the world's history, the Declaration of Independence. [Applause.] To those who are lacking in love of our great and good country I would suggest that they go to that shrine of liberty and imbibe the true spirit of patriotism.

You would hardly think it possible that one as enthusiastic as I am over my adopted country and its institutions could have observed conditions that would wound the pride of any American citizen. The incident to which I refer was brought to my notice when visiting the Fatherland last year.

After roaming around a few days in the great city of Berlin the thought struck me that the American ambassador might be curious to inspect a newly elected Congressman from Wisconsin and ascertain just what a Badger looks like. [Laughter.]

I inquired of a number of persons whom I met, also of some of the generally well-posted policemen, where the United States embassy could be found, but while they knew the location of all the other embassies, including the British, the French, the Spanish, and the Russian, they could not tell me where the United States ambassador held forth. But I soon ceased to express surprise at their lack of information, after I finally succeeded in finding the place, which is marked by a miniature specimen of our glorious Stars and Stripes, dangling from the second-story window of a very ordinary-looking building.

Here the ambassador of the greatest and most prosperous country in the world holds forth, directly above what looked to me to be a second-hand book store.

Directly opposite is the Russian embassy, a building reflecting credit upon that great Empire. A little farther up the street is the French embassy, a structure that impresses one with the wealth and importance of our sister Republic.

Next in point of beauty of architecture is the Spanish embassy, while the British have laid more stress on solidity and firmness, indicative of England's power and magnitude.

How proud the citizens of those countries must be who visit Berlin when they see those beautiful structures owned by the Government of the land they hail from.

How proud they must feel of their citizenship when they observe the large flags of their country floating over the building in which their ambassador holds forth.

Citizens of other countries can not but be impressed by the showing made by these countries, and I am sure that the prestige thus gained returns good interest on the investment.

But no American, be he ever so proud of his citizenship, experienced an increase of pride when he gazed at the second-hand book store, the rooms over which are occupied by the representative of the most prosperous nation of the earth. No American ever looked at that tiny banner, the glorious Stars and Stripes, thrown to the breeze from the second-story window and then glanced at the immense banner floating over the Russian embassy across the street without having his pride as an American citizen severely wounded.

A stranger acting on the impression made by the several embassies would in looking at our dingy quarters, arrive at the conclusion that we were the cheapest and poorest nation on earth.

I believe that even Jefferson, with the simple and plain life that he led, would, if he were alive to-day, insist that we keep step with other nations in housing our representatives in foreign countries. [Applause.]

While I have only referred to our embassy in Berlin, those who have seen the offices occupied by our ambassadors in other European capitals report similar conditions.

Every ambassador or minister of every other nation occupies a building owned by his government, and of which no citizen visiting in those countries need feel ashamed. In addition, the representatives of other nations receive salaries that enable them to live as their positions demand, and to represent their countries so as to reflect credit upon them.

The American ambassadors and ministers, with very scant salaries as compared with other representatives, must, in order to make both ends meet, live in a style which is unworthy of a representative of our great nation, and if relying solely upon their salaries, they can not lend that dignity to their high office which is necessary to properly impress the people and officials of the countries to which they have been sent.

Not wishing to humiliate themselves and their country, many of our most brilliant men possessed of but limtied means have refused to accept these positions which otherwise they would have been well fitted for.

Others again, who thought that with the aid of their private means they might be able to do justice to the position, were forced to abandon their place upon ascertaining that to keep up with representatives of other countries they had to sacrifice all and more than they could call their own.

We certainly have a number of men in both Houses of Congress who would do honor to the position of ambassador or minister in foreign countries, but only a few of them—only men of means—can, under present conditions, afford to accept a place of that character and properly represent our country.

The President in filling these places is therefore obliged to make his selection from the rich men of our country who have abundant means, and who do not rely solely upon their salary to secure whatever is needed to lend dignity to the high office to which they have been appointed.

While the offices occupied by our present ambassador in Germany are far from luxurious, he has helped matters along by leasing a residence that is equal to the finest in the German capital and well fitted to entertain the Emperor and other dignitaries. In doing this he helped materially to further the friendly relations existing between the two countries.

His yearly rental for this building is $20,000, while his salary is but $17,500.

It is certainly contrary to all traditions of our Republic to have only men of wealth represent us in foreign countries, but niggardly as we have been in providing for all ambassadors and ministers, it is very fortunate that our Presidents have always succeeded in finding men for these positions who, besides possessing all-around qualifications, had ample funds to supply whatever necessary to lend dignity to their position.

With our constant claim that in the filling of positions the rich man is given no advantage over the one with limited means or over the poor man, proclaiming as we do equal rights to all, it becomes our plain duty to change conditions so that any American citizen, if intellectually fitted for the position, but not financially so, may hold one of these foreign offices.

We must either pay them salaries to cover all necessary expenses of living, without falling back on their own resources, or, if we are opposed to increasing salaries, we must then furnish our representatives in foreign countries with proper quarters and provide funds for maintaining them.

These buildings need not necessarily be palaces, but they ought to be such as to reflect dignity upon our great country.

It would be unwise and altogether too expensive to immediately provide for proper buildings in all foreign capitals, but we can not afford to wait any longer before making a start in that direction.

A bill introduced by me, No. 9238, authorizes the Secretary of State to acquire in Berlin, Paris, London, and St. Petersburg, proper sites and buildings to be used by the United States ambassadors in those cities, the cost in each case not to exceed $500,000.

If he is so authorized, it may be possible for the Secretary of State to secure buildings in those cities that, offered at a reasonable price, would be suitable for the purpose desired.

If the outlay of $2,000,000 for the embassies I mentioned is not considered wise at this time, let a start be made by appropriating $500,000 for an embassy in Berlin.

By so doing you will at least prevent my pride as an American citizen from receiving another shock, which would surely be the case if on my next visit to Berlin I should again be obliged to cast my eyes upon that diminutive specimen of our glorious banner dangling from the second-story window of the United States ambassador's office, located over a second-hand bookstore. [Applause.]

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I object.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] the rest of the time until 5 o'clock.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, when the Secretary of the Navy announced from his home city of Oakland, Cal., on the 4th day of July, 1907—a most appropriate date, by the way—that a large fleet of battle ships was to visit the Pacific coast, the news aroused the most violent opposition in certain quarters. To now quote some of these spasms of wrath which appeared in portions of the Eastern press seems almost cruel in view of the fact that at this very moment, with the fleet about to enter California ports, after nearly 14,000 miles have been successfully traversed, the cruise has been triumphantly justified in the minds of the American people.

The New York World, for instance, on the morning of July 6, 1907, gravely warned the Commander in Chief in the following words:

> If President Roosevelt seriously meditates sending the battle-ship fleet to the Pacific there is still ample time to prevent what may prove to be a most disastrous blunder. A long ocean cruise of the battle-ship fleet to the Pacific is wholly unnecessary. * * * It is time for Theodore Roosevelt to turn back the tide. It is time for him as President of the United States to announce to all the world that the battle ships of the United States are not going to the Pacific and that this jingo propaganda must cease.

On the following day the World again thundered forth as follows:

> There is no reason known to sensible government or sensible diplomacy why the battle ships should be sent to the Pacific. * * * One simple, plain duty now confronts the President. It is to announce officially, authoritatively, flatly, and positively that the Atlantic fleet will not be sent to the Pacific.

The New York Evening Post was as fully agitated. On the day following the Secretary's announcement it commented as follows:

> We can not too strongly emphasize the folly of any such action. * * * If the battle ships must have a long sea cruise, by all means let them visit Labrador or the Cape of Good Hope or even Madagascar. But on no ground of discipline or efficiency could a voyage to the Pacific rather than to any other seas be justified. * * * We could hardly have a better example of the way a navy, so far from being a safeguard, can become a grave menace to the peace of the nation.

It can scarcely be wondered at that the people of the Far West, having always had cause to believe that the Pacific as well as the Atlantic coast constituted a part of our common country, should evince the greatest astonishment at the expressions of such pronounced opposition following the announcement that a fleet of American battle ships was to visit the Pacific coast. In voting for an adequate Navy your Representatives in Congress from the Far West have always regarded that Navy as national, believing that the Pacific seaboard had just as much share in it and fully as much right to it as the coast bordering on the Atlantic Ocean.

This opposition is all the more striking when the statement is made that at the very moment the news of the projected cruise was given to the world there was not a single American battle ship in commission in the great Pacific Ocean, nor was

there a single coast-defense vessel in commission, the *Wyoming*, the only vessel of that type then there, being at the yard undergoing repairs.

The most effective ships at that time in commission on the Pacific coast were the three semiarmored cruisers *Charleston*, *St. Louis*, and *Milwaukee*, vessels of 9,700 tons and 22 knots speed, protected by a partial and light belt of 4-inch armor and a 3-inch deck, and carrying a battery of fourteen 6-inch guns. The cruisers *California* and *South Dakota* were on the coast, but not then in commission. The protected cruisers *Chicago* and *Albany*, both old boats, built in 1885 and 1897, were on the coast and in commission. There were a few destroyers and torpedo boats.

In Central American waters was stationed the gunboat *Yorktown*, while on the Asiatic side of the Pacific, a most important station, was an armored-cruiser squadron consisting of four vessels of the *California* class, the *Colorado*, *Maryland*, *Pennsylvania*, and *West Virginia*. There were, in addition, the protected cruisers *Cincinnati* and *Raleigh*, built sixteen years ago, and the *Denver*, *Chattanooga*, and *Galveston*, and a few old monitors and ten gunboats. Three of these gunboats were quite modern, but the seven captured from Spain are out of date. The gunboat *Annapolis* was stationed at Samoa.

To recapitulate, then, our fighting strength in the Pacific Ocean on the 4th day of July, when announcement was made of the projected cruise which called forth the bitter opposition to which I have referred, consisted of not a single battle ship, our naval force being represented by six armored cruisers of the *California* class, three semiarmored cruisers of the *Charleston* class, eight small protected cruisers from 11 to 16 years of age, four modern gunboats, four destroyers, and three torpedo boats.

The Secretary of the Navy is powerless to permanently assign a formidable fleet to Pacific waters if Congress fails to supply the ships.

The entire world, Mr. Chairman, now acknowledges the wisdom and far-sightedness of President Roosevelt and Secretary Metcalf in planning this remarkable and epoch-making cruise, the greatest in the history of this country, a cruise which is placing the American Navy on a high level in the world's opinion. As the mighty fleet of sixteen battle ships, the departure of which from Hampton Roads it was my privilege to witness, steamed down the coast of Central and South America the inhabitants of the commonwealths of Latin America were most profoundly impressed, awakening to a new realization of the tremendous power which insures the maintenance and enforcement of the Monroe doctrine, which only the actual sight of the the mighty and formidable armada could have awakened. What is actually seen is never forgotten. The spectacle will exert a powerful and lasting influence upon these people, inspiring respect for a flag that is too infrequently seen in Central and South American waters owing to the decline of our merchant marine. The emblems of European nations, which are alive to the importance of foreign markets, are far more familiar to our southern neighbors than the Stars and Stripes.

As the fleet passed through the hazardous Straits of Magellan there was brought home to every American citizen a full appreciation of the tremendous importance of the speedy completion of the great Panama Canal. Had this mighty interoceanic waterway been completed the sixteen battle ships could have made the trip from Hampton Roads to San Francisco in twenty-seven days, and it would have been necessary to replenish the coal supply but once. The distance via the canal is approximately 5,258 miles, as against about 13,782 miles through the Straits of Magellan—a saving of 8,524 miles.

When the battle ship *Oregon* made the famous run from San Francisco to join the Atlantic fleet in Cuban waters during the Spanish-American war, the people of California and of the entire country followed the movements of the San Francisco built ship with almost breathless anxiety, the significance of the elements of time and distance entering into the transfer of a fleet from coast to coast being brought home with telling effect.

Every thoughtful American citizen must admit that the Pacific Ocean is the great stage upon which the world's chief drama is to be played in the future, and as the Atlantic fleet headed northward after safely threading its way through the straits a new era in the history of this country began. All eyes are now turned irresistibly westward, the present center of world interest, as the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs so eloquently stated a few moments ago. With the fleet where it is to-day, the mastery of the Pacific is settled. So apparent is this fact that there is a growing demand, and one that is rapidly becoming insistent, that a strong fleet be permanently maintained in Pacific waters. [Applause.]

Every competent naval expert maintains that there should be two effective units of the navy—one in each ocean. If our present naval force will not permit of this, then the country should demand, and the Pacific coast in particular, that the necessary increase be made. The President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, declares that in his opinion four new battle ships are necessary at this time, appreciating as he does the growing importance of the Pacific. Believing that it is safe to follow the lead of President Roosevelt in this important matter, I shall therefore cast my vote for four battle ships. With the weight of our naval power on the Pacific we are insuring peace. You can no longer neglect the Pacific coast, for such neglect imperils the commercial interests of America. Unconsciously, perhaps, but nevertheless irresistibly, we are being drawn into the very vortex of the Far Eastern question. Maintain a strong fleet in a locality that experts declare to be most vulnerable. The Pacific coast is our door to China, Japan, Australia, the South Seas, the west coast of South and Central America, Alaska, and Mexico. In the development of China the world generally acknowledges that industrially and geographically the United States is in a position to take full advantage of the tremendous opportunities offered.

The Pacific coast is lacking in proper defenses. In a message sent to the Fifty-ninth Congress, first session, by President Roosevelt, he urged in the following language the increasing importance of proper coast defenses:

> The necessity for a complete and adequate system of coast defense is greater to-day than twenty years ago, for the increased wealth of the country offers more tempting inducements to attack and a hostile fleet can reach our coast in a much shorter period of time. The fact that we now have a Navy does not in any way diminish the importance of coast defenses; on the contrary, that fact emphasizes their value and the necessity for their construction. It is an accepted naval maxim that a navy can be used to strategic advantage only when acting on the offensive, and it can be free to so operate only after our coast defense is reasonably secure and so recognized by the country. It was due to the securely defended condition of the Japanese ports that the Japanese fleet was free to seek out and watch its proper objective—the Russian fleet—without fear of interruption or recall to guard its home ports against raids by the Vladivostok squadron. This, one of the most valuable lessons of the late war in the East, is worthy of serious consideration by our country, with its extensive coast line, its many important harbors, and its many wealthy manufacturing coast cities. The security and protection of our interests require the completion of the defenses of our coast.

San Francisco, however, is fast becoming one of the strongest fortified cities in the country. There are defenses at the mouth of the Columbia, at Puget Sound, and San Diego, but except at the places named an enemy could land with little difficulty. San Pedro Harbor, in southern California, is exposed, and the Representatives in Congress from that section of the State are urging that this important point be fortified. The Representatives from the State of Washington justly complain of the inadequacy of the Puget Sound defenses. Alaska and Hawaii, detached Territories, are at the mercy of a hostile fleet. It is to the lasting credit of this House that by a vote of 246 to 1, we, on Monday of this week, passed the following bill providing for a naval station at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, and making immediately available the sum of $650,000, which bill was unanimously reported by the House Committee on Naval Affairs:

> A bill (H. R. 20308) to establish a naval station at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.
>
> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to establish a naval station at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, on the site heretofore acquired for that purpose; and to erect thereat all the necessary machine shops, storehouses, coal sheds, and other necessary buildings, at an aggregate cost of not to exceed $500,000, and to build thereat one graving dry dock capable of receiving the largest war vessels of the Navy, at a cost not to exceed $2,000,000.
>
> SEC. 2. That the sums hereinafter stated are hereby appropriated and made immediately available, to be expended at the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, to wit: Toward dredging an entrance channel of a depth of 35 feet, $200,000; toward construction of dry dock, $300,000; toward erecting machine shops, storehouses, coal sheds, and other necessary buildings, $100,000; toward yard development, $50,000; in all, $650,000.
>
> SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Navy may, in his discretion, enter into contracts for any portion of the work, including material therefor, within the respective limits of cost herein stipulated, subject to appropriations to be made therefor by Congress.

The isolated Philippines, with their undeveloped wealth, are also inadequately protected, although progress is gradually being made looking to a proper safeguarding of these insular possessions, neglect of which jeopardizes the peace of the Far East. The Atlantic and Gulf coasts are dotted with large repair stations located at Portsmouth, N. H.; Boston, Mass.; Philadelphia (League Island); New York; Norfolk, Va.; Pensacola, Fla.; New Orleans, La., and Charleston, S. C.

On the Pacific coast we have but two repair stations, located at Mare Island, California, and on Puget Sound, Washington. The Mare Island Navy-Yard was established in 1852, and for nearly

fifty years has done practically all the repair work on the Pacific coast for the Navy and also much for the transports of the Army. Strategically there is no yard in the country better located, protected as it is from attack by a hostile fleet. It is generally admitted that the Mare Island Navy-Yard is the second best equipped yard in the country and capable of building almost any character of ship. There is now in course of construction in that yard the 16-knot fleet collier *Prometheus*, rapid and most satisfactory progress being made on this vessel. Mare Island Navy-Yard has been attacked in some quarters because it has been necessary, owing to the increasing draft of naval vessels, to do considerable dredging in the channel leading to the yard. Part of the dredging would be required for the needs of commerce if there was no navy-yard at the present location. In this connection I would like to call attention to the fact that there is not a navy-yard in the country where money has not been spent, and in many it is still being expended, to maintain a sufficient channel depth, as evidenced by the following statement from the Navy Department:

Statement showing amounts spent for dredging at the various navy-yards from the date of their establishment up to the present time:

Boston	$152,501.34
Charleston	108,000.00
Guam	17,500.00
Guantanamo	40,000.00
Key West	101,000.00
League Island	984,159.26
Mare Island	500,699.96
New Orleans	9,225.73
New York	408,561.92
Norfolk	122,658.67
Olongapo	55,500.00
Pensacola	70,000.00
Port Royal	266,000.00
Portsmouth	774,000.00
Puget Sound	50,000.00
San Juan	2,000.00
Washington	25,349.00

From this statement it can be readily seen that in a number of the navy-yards larger sums have been and are still being expended than required for Mare Island, and yet Mare Island is continually being criticised, while expenditures at Eastern yards for like purposes are never referred to. Nearly $17,000,000 have been invested at Mare Island. The yard has done and is still doing splendid construction and repair work. The climate is most equable all the year. The idea of abandoning the yard is preposterous, and not worthy of even serious consideration.

The draft of battle ships has been so rapidly increasing during recent years that there are now many ports throughout the United States that they can not enter with safety, as recently pointed out by the senior Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] in a speech in the United States Senate on February 21 of this year. Our battle ships draw from 26 to 28 feet of water. The harbor of Portland, Me., has 30 feet of water; Boston, 27; New York, 35; Philadelphia, 23; Baltimore, 30; Norfolk, 28; Savannah, 22; Charleston, 26; Key West, 26; Mobile, 23; New Orleans, 28; Galveston, 27; San Diego, 27½; San Francisco, 33, and Portland, Oreg., about 19 or 20 feet.

With this great awakening in the Pacific, carrying with it the fortification of our home coast and insular possessions, the crying need of a merchant marine equal to that of other nations competing with us for the trade of the Pacific should appeal to every thoughtful American citizen. The knowledge that the coal supplying our fleet has been carried in foreign bottoms brings the question to our attention with mighty force. Each year this question will grow in importance.

This cruise of the battle ships, the greatest in history, is not as yet completed. Twenty-three thousand miles will be covered, according to estimates, after leaving San Francisco. In all, over 37,000 miles will be the record when anchor is finally cast on the fleet's arrival on the Atlantic coast in February, 1909.

England, Australia, Japan, and China have extended invitations to the fleet, and these marked evidences of friendship are of great diplomatic significance. In the Orient our prestige will be vastly increased by the display of fighting ships.

The cordiality of Japan will grow more marked as the fleet approaches the Far East. The visit to Japanese ports under such happy circumstances will lead to a better understanding between the two nations, and the announcement of the acceptance of Japan's invitation has already silenced the last note of opposition to the cruise and taken from the jingo press its last round of ammunition. The cruise was happily conceived by the President and Secretary of the Navy, and its success is proving greater even than they anticipated.

The people of the Pacific coast welcome the fleet, and they ask and insist—and their request is but reasonable—that there be permanently assigned to the far western seaboard of this great nation a fleet of battle ships commensurate with the growing importance of the Pacific. [Loud applause.]

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], I will yield seven minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. Chairman, more than forty years have elapsed since the remnants of two great armies met for the last time at Appomattox. Whatever prejudice, whatever bitterness, whatever injustice survived this parting found no lasting place in the hearts of those who had borne the brunt of battle. In the shallow graves of those who did not live to see the dawn of peace blue and gray slept side by side, as do children of the same mother. Honor and valor had exacted the sacrifice, and the true soldier, North and South, standing over these graves, grounded his arms and said, "It is enough."

If those who saved the Union in fact by offering their lives for its existence had also been intrusted with the Government's policy of reconstruction, the legislation that I am going to ask for and that I have proposed in a bill—H. R. 19747—would have been unnecessary. The bill to which I refer is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 19747) to provide for refunding to lawful claimants the proceeds of the cotton tax unlawfully collected.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall, immediately upon the passage and approval of this act, compile a statement showing the amount of money illegally collected by the United States Government on account of the tax on cotton for the years 1863, 1864, 1865, 1866, 1867, and 1868, respectively, in the several States, and showing, if possible, the persons, firms, or corporations paying the same, with the amounts so paid, which statement, when properly certified as to its correctness, shall be filed with the clerk of the Court of Claims and a duplicate thereof filed with the Treasurer of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the Court of Claims is hereby clothed with full and complete authority and jurisdiction to hear, try, and adjudicate all claims made under this act by persons, firms, or corporations, or their lawful heirs or representatives, claiming to have paid such tax for any or for all the years herein stated, and when said Court of Claims shall have adjudged a claim just and lawfully made, in the name of the proper party or parties, it shall approve the same, and the clerk of said Court of Claims shall certify said approval and transmit the approved claim to the Treasurer of the United States, who shall pay the same.

SEC. 3. That a sum sufficient to cover the total amount of cotton tax collected, as shown by the statement of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, is hereby appropriated, out of any funds in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the same shall be available for the payment of all approved claims for the refund of said cotton tax, claimants to have five years in which to present and establish their claims, and the unexpended balance accredited to each State, after all approved claims have been paid and pending claims deducted, shall be paid to the treasurer of that State, to be used as a public school fund.

SEC. 4. That this act shall take effect immediately upon its passage and approval by the President.

I refer to the refunding of the cotton taxes illegally collected, mainly from the Southern States.

That this tax was illegal, that it was unjust, from whatever standpoint viewed, there is not a shadow of doubt. In the only case brought before the Supreme Court of the United States the eight judges sitting were divided, four and four. Leading men who have stood in line of battle in the Union Army, notably, Hon. Charles H. Grosvenor, whose ability we all know, whose zeal as a Federalist is unquestioned, whose judgment is worthy of the highest respect, freely state that this tax was wrong, illegal, and unconstitutional. This legislative body admitted its error by repealing the act after 1868, even in the midst of most hostile legislation against the South.

If the act of Congress could have been justified on any possible ground, the spirit of the Federal Government then prevalent would have kept that act on the statutes until the last farthing of the expense incurred in the civil war had been paid. This was nothing more than an indirect effort to exact war indemnity. The quarrel with the South could not be justified, except on the ground of farsighted expediency. From the Northern point of view, the Southern States did not accomplish their withdrawal from the Union, and hence they were necessarily clothed with the same power, entitled to the same privileges, and free from the same exemptions as were all other States. If the Southern States were out of the Union, then they were not amenable to the Constitution. If they were actually, or even technically, at all times a part of the Union, then they were entitled to that fair and indiscriminate treatment that is guaranteed under the Constitution. It was apparent, even to the South's bitterest enemies in Congress at the time, that the cotton tax was unconstitutional, without the semblance of legal justification, and so the acts were repealed.

Can a Government so powerful, so wealthy, so generous in its dealings with dependent subjects in far away islands, refuse to restore to its own citizens that which has been taken in violation of the Constitution? It is estimated that our efforts at subjugation, education, and assimilation in our oriental posses-

sions have cost this Government something like $800,000,000. To refund this cotton tax would require something like $68,000,000. Should we not be a little just before we are so very generous?

If there was no just ground for continuing the cotton tax, if there was even doubt of the legality of the tax, was not the money collected prior to the repeal of the act too questionable to be appropriated finally by a just and powerful nation? May we not hope that justice has been retarded not because of smoldering sectionalism, but because of lack of knowledge of the facts?

Such exhaustive and conclusive arguments have been advanced in recent speeches before this body, proving the illegality of the cotton tax, that I shall not enter extensively into this phase of the subject. But I hope that in the brief review that I shall make of the law and the facts the legislative conscience will be awakened.

All that is contained in the Constitution giving Congress the right to tax is found in the following provisions:

1. Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, etc.
2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises; to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.
3. No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census of enumeration hereinbefore directed to be taken.
4. No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State.

Taxes may be divided into two general classes—direct and indirect. Indirect taxes are the duties levied on imports which the consumer pays in buying the imported article.

The best, and yet a most erroneous contention, undertaking to justify this cotton tax, may be found in a letter of Hon. Israel Kimball, once Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in which he alleged that it was an indirect tax, and that it was paid by the consumer. This would be partly true, if the cotton producer fixed the price of his product and could add the tax to the selling price.

But who does not know that the price of cotton is fixed in New York and Liverpool regardless of the producer? Besides, at that time there was no duty on any kind of cotton imported into this country, and the domestic article could not be sold higher than the imported article free of duty. Any attempt to justify the cotton tax on the ground that it was indirect, and hence not paid by the producer, is too absurd to admit of serious argument. But suppose, for sake of argument, that this was an indirect tax, does it conform to that clause of the Constitution which provides:

That all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Under the acts levying taxes on cotton for the years mentioned in my bill South Carolina paid $4,172,420.16, while Connecticut paid $193.64 and Delaware paid nothing. It is a well-known fact that climatic conditions confine the raising of cotton to a section of the United States. Congress knew that a tax on all the crops of the Southern States would have been too palpably unconstitutional to receive the sanction of a majority vote, even of biased reconstructionists, and so, by a little legislative circumvention, it was sought to give validity to a clearly unconstitutional act. It was sought to give the acts the appearance of general application by using the following language:

There shall be paid by the producer, owner, or holder upon all cotton produced within the United States, etc.

Suppose a bill were proposed here levying a heavy tax on all sugar, hemp, wheat, or corn—that is to say, on any one of these articles exclusively raised in the United States. Would there not be a howl from the sections raising this article against such unjust discrimination? While these products are confined to certain sections of country, no one of them is so circumscribed as cotton. Cotton is not and can not be raised uniformly throughout the United States, and hence as an indirect tax it can not conform to the main requirement—that it shall be "uniform throughout the United States."

The fact is, the tax on cotton was a direct tax. Let us see what a direct tax is defined to be. Perry, on political economy, uses the following language:

A direct tax is levied on the very persons who are themselves expected to pay it.

The fact is, the producer did actually pay the cotton tax.

An excise is one form of direct tax, and under this specific head the cotton tax properly belonged, if it had been legally levied. Judge Story says:

An excise is an inland imposition or duty; a duty or tax laid on certain articles produced or consumed at home.

Here was an article produced and largely consumed at home. It was properly subject to an excise, if levied in accordance with the Constitution. But hear again the language of the Constitution:

All duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

That is, they shall fall with impartiality on Maine and Texas alike. Does a tax on cotton come within the requirements?

Again the Constitution says:

No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid unless in proportion to the census.

By the census of 1860 the total population of the United States was 31,445,089, and of the eleven cotton States 9,103,333. The total cotton tax collected amounted to $68,072,388.99. Of this amount, eleven cotton States paid $64,701,352.76. Georgia paid over $11,000,000 and Maine paid nothing. How is this for laying the tax in conformity to the Constitution:

In proportion to the census or enumeration.

Again, in the language of the Constitution:

No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State.

At the time of the collection of the cotton taxes more than half of the entire crop was exported abroad. A strict definition of the word "export" includes shipment from one State to another. In this sense more than four-fifths of the entire crop was exported. Nothing could be clearer than that the cotton tax was, in this respect, violative of the Constitution.

There are some who do not pretend to justify the cotton tax from a legal or constitutional standpoint, but claim that it was a war measure and that the country was justified in suspending the Constitution. While this is the only honest contention that can be set up, it certainly could not be applicable to the taxes collected in 1867 and 1868, amounting to three-fourths of the entire collections, when peace reigned throughout the land. As for the taxes collected during the war, they may have been justified by the rule of might, but not by the rule of right. An army may be justified in confiscating or destroying property, as a legitimate war measure; but that a rich, proud, and powerful government will defy its own prescribed rule of conduct, to tax, under the guise of law, a poor and bleeding people, I refuse to believe.

If, blinded by prejudice and exasperated by the resistance that had for so long set at naught the Federal forces, the Government did in haste that which was unwarranted under the Constitution, has not the day of restitution come?

Perhaps few of the original taxpayers are living to enter their claims. The descendants, in many instances, could establish just claims, and any unclaimed amount might be turned over to the various State treasurers, for use in the common school fund.

This appeal is to the mind, after the passions have subsided. It is not made in the name of charity, nor yet is it a demand, but plainly and unequivocally it is a call to the performance of a duty, which if longer neglected must reflect upon the honesty of the nation. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

RECESS.

The CHAIRMAN. The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, under the order of the House the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union will stand in recess until 11.30 o'clock to-morrow morning.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. KAHN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16757) for the incorporation of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1418), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13844) to authorize and require the Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company to maintain and operate a track connection with the United States navy-yard in the city of Washington, D. C., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1419), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the resolution of the House

(H. Res. 328) directing the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to transmit to the House information as to prices of meat products monthly during the last two years, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1420), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the bills of the House H. R. 14013, 12660, 15249, 9130, and 17704, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 20591) for the appropriation of moneys from the sale of public lands for the establishment and maintenance of schools or departments of instruction in mines and mining in the various States and Territories, accompanied by a report (No. 1421), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20122) granting an increase of pension to Charles Heywood, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 20582) to amend an act entitled "An act in amendment of sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled 'An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents,' approved May 9, 1900"—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 20583) providing for the improvement and repairs to the court-house and post-office building at Paducah, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 20584) to amend the act approved July 2, 1890, entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against any unlawful restraints and monopolies"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 20585) for the payment of outstanding warrants against moneys belonging to the Chickasaw Nation for certain purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 20586) authorizing Samuel W. Fordyce and others to construct a bridge across the Rio Grande at some point at or near the town of Brownsville, in Cameron County, Tex.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 20587) to establish a Department of Labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 20588) to provide for the payment of water powers and water rights—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 20589) to provide for the construction of a light-vessel for Winter Quarter Shoal Station, seacoast of Virginia—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 20590) to increase the pensions of widows of soldiers and sailors of the late civil war, the war with Mexico, the various Indian wars, and so forth, and to grant pensions to certain widows of such soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois, from the Committee on Mines and Mining: A bill (H. R. 20591) for the appropriation of moneys from the sale of public lands for the establishment and maintenance of schools or departments of instruction in mines and mining in the various States and Territories—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. CONNER: A bill (H. R. 20592) to extend the provisions of the act of June 27, 1902, entitled "An act to extend the provisions, limitations, and benefits of an act entitled 'An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk war, Cherokee disturbance, and the Seminole war,' approved July 27, 1892."—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Resolution (H. Res. 334) asking why certain Indians are now being imprisoned in Arizona by order of the Interior Department—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 165) for the enrollment of certain persons as members of the Osage tribe of Indians, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills nad resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 20593) for the relief of Alberti Operti—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 20594) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Wall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20595) granting a pension to Lee Ison—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20596) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20597) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. J. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20598) granting an inrcease of pension to Perry Kains—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20599) for the relief of Harriett Ann Crank—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20600) for the relief of James H. C. Mann—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20601) granting an increase of pension to John T. Dean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20602) for the relief of H. P. Elderman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20603) granting an increase of pension to John M. Gardner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20604) granting a pension to Edward Shields—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20605) for the relief of G. W. Darnell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20606) granting an increase of pension to William T. Tomlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20607) granting an increase of pension to John P. Huff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20608) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. Gallup—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20609) for the relief of Jeremiah Hunt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20610) granting an increase of pension to James K. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20611) granting an increase of pension to Clabon W. Stiltner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20612) granting an increase of pension to William H. Ryder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A bill (H. R. 20613) to compensate C. W. Smith for services and disbursements made in the war with Spain—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20614) granting an increase of pension to Alvin Eck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 20615) for the relief of Charles P. Ryan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 20616) granting an increase of pensions to James Ousley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 20617) to protect the rights of Jack Risner, an intermarried Choctaw citizen—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 20618) to protect the rights of Laura Stewart, a Choctaw citizen by blood—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIG: A bill (H. R. 20619) for the relief of the heirs of Jesse Glawson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DENBY: A bill (H. R. 20620) for the relief of Theodore E. Rollett—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 20621) granting an increase of pension to John H. Hail—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD: A bill (H. R. 20622) for the relief of James H. Gaines—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 20623) granting a pension to Garet Williamson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20624) granting an increase of pension to William J. Chandler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20625) granting a pension to Lawrence Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20626) granting a pension to Elie Gaston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20627) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Reibel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 20628) granting an increase of pension to Edward R. Blain—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 20629) granting an increase of pension to Edward C. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 20630) granting an increase of pension to Barzilla Greenwood—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20631) granting a pension to Daniel R. Cone—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20632) granting an increase of pension to John E. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20633) granting a pension to William B. Gilpin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20634) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor McDevitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20635) to correct the military record of Charles W. Becker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 20636) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Waters, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 20637) granting an increase of pension to Peter Girard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 20638) for the relief of Frank W. Tucker—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 20639) granting a pension to Delilah Colley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20640) granting a pension to Demia T. Stump—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 20641) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Riner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20642) granting an increase of pension to William Vanatta—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20643) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert Ward—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REID: A bill (H. R. 20644) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Brashears—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20645) granting a pension to Morgan Reasor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 20646) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of David Ryan against The United States—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: A bill (H. R. 20647) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia M. Botts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 20648) granting a pension to William H. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20649) granting an increase of pension to John B. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 20650) granting an increase of pension to Oscar F. Corson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 20651) granting an increase of pension to Melville C. Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 20652) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of J. T. Hawkes and 22 others, citizens of Westbrook, Me., in favor of H. R. 15837, for a national highways commission and appropriation giving Federal aid to construction and maintenance of public highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition of Auburn Grange, of Auburn, Me., for national highways commission and Federal aid in construction of public roads (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURNETT: Affidavits to accompany H. R. 20535, for the relief of Mittie or Mary Trayler, daughter of Henry T. Butts, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: Petition of South Division Civic Association of Milwaukee, against any increase in quantity of water taken from Lake Michigan into the Chicago Drainage Canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DUNWELL: Petition of Furman & Page, favoring H. R. 14934, making shippers, consignees, and transportation companies more careful—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Edward Smith & Co., against legislation unfavorably affecting sale and interchange of paints—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Frank Roman and others, for remedial legislation excluding labor from the provisions of the Sherman antitrust act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Security Savings Bank, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, for enactment of a purely emergency currency act—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring S. 4812, regulating child labor in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of New York, against H. R. 19245, relative to obstructive material in New York Harbor and adjacent waters—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of New York, for increase of salaries of judges of circuit and district courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of city of Richmond, relative to the Aldrich currency bill (S. 3023)—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of national banks of St. Louis, against the Aldrich currency bill (S. 3023)—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Union Veteran Legion Encampment, for $200,000 for an armory on the site of fort built by Gen. Anthony Wayne—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Association for the Protection of the Adirondacks, for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DUREY: Petition of Saratoga (N. Y.) Spanish War Veterans, for battle-ship construction in the New York Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to John H. Hail—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of six national banks of Milwaukee, against the Aldrich currency bill (S. 3023)—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of national banks of Milwaukee, against the Aldrich currency bill (S. 3023)—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of New York City, N. Y., in favor of additional compensation to United States judges (S. 4356)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOYD: Papers to accompany H. R. 20086, for the relief of W. M. Boyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORNES: Petitions of John J. McGovern and James J. Moore, of New York City, against a treaty of arbitration with Great Britain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Edward R. Blain—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of W. T. Garrett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Jacob Dillon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of James C. Rowlett—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of Minnesota Road Makers' Association, favoring a national highways commission and appropriation for Federal aid in construction and improvement of highways (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDERMOTT: Petition of Chicago city council, favoring H. R. 15123 and 15267 and S. 4395, relative to conduct of telegraph companies—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Lake Seamen's Union, against H. R. 225, to amend section 4463 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois: Petitions of J. M. Shehan and others, Bessee Lacke and others, John H. Hearns and others, Alfred Markus and others, and Emil Friend and others, protesting against the atrocities practiced by the Russian Government in its warfare against its own people—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of Manchester Grange, No. 501, Patrons of Husbandry, of Manchester, N. Y., for highways improvement (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of many citizens of New York State against atrocities of the Russian Government toward its own people—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RHINOCK: Petition of W. J. Arnold and other citizens of Kentucky, for a national highways commission and Federal aid in construction of highways (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of International Association of Bridge and Structural Iron Workers, of Cincinnati, Ohio, against prohibition legislation for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RYAN: Petitions of Polish Roman Catholic Union of America; Polish Union of America; Polish Patriotic Ladies' Society Manda, 1,150 members; Polish Falcon, No. 6; Central Association of Woodmen of the World, 8 lodges, 1,400 members; Polish Organizations of Black Rock; St. Barbaras Parish, of West Seneca, N. Y.; the Poles of Buffalo in mass meeting assembled, and Kosciuszko Camp, No. 92, Woodmen of the World, against the Polish expropriation act of the Prussian Diet—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of Lake Seaman's Union, against H. R. 225, amending section 4463 of Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Association for Protection of the Adirondacks, favoring H. R. 10457 (for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Petition of A. A. Johnson, praying for the creation of a national highways commission (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: Petitions of R. H. Jutt and 21 others, residents of Potter County; H. O. Rice and 16 others, residents of Tioga County; H. S. Burt and 32 others, residents of Potter County; Albert Dunning and 24 others, residents of Tioga County, and A. B. Wheeler and 14 others, residents of Tioga County, all in the State of Pennsylvania, for S. 3152, for additional protection to dairy interests—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of David Wurster and 18 others, residents of Lycoming County, Pa., for a national highways commission and for Federal aid in road construction (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of sundry citizens of Michigan, for amendment of the Sherman antitrust laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *April 11, 1908.*

[*Continuation of the legislative day of Monday, April 6, 1908.*]

The recess having expired, the committee, at 11 o'clock and 30 minutes a. m., was called to order by the Chairman, Mr. MANN.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the condition of the time of both sides.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has consumed two hours and fifty-four minutes and the gentleman from Tennessee two hours and ten minutes.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, then I ask the gentleman from Tennessee to go ahead.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG].

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, the upbuliding of our Navy, like providing all means of national defense, should be, and I believe is, absolutely nonpartisan. There are men on that side of the House and there are men on this side of the House, level-headed, well-balanced men, who do not oppose a navy, but who believe that the naval appropriations should be kept within reasonable limits. [Applause.] They believe that the naval appropriations should not bear any unfair or unjust proportion to the sums of money needed and appropriated to the other branches of the Government. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, there are gentlemen upon that side and there are gentlemen upon this side who seem to be navy mad. Their thought by day is of much navy, and their dream by night is of more navy. They seem to have no care for the efficient administration of any other branch of the public service. If permitted to have their way, they would cripple the other needs of the Government in order to expend on the Navy more than its just proportion of the nation's revenue.

They would cut short the improvement of our waterways and of our harbors. We are to have no river and harbor bill this year because we have not sufficient funds, but I hear no suggestion from the Navy enthusiasts to in any way economize on the Navy. On the contrary, they are making an effort to increase the appropriation beyond what the Committee on Naval Affairs after careful consideration has determined upon.

They would postpone the completion of our coast defenses.

The War Department this year recommended $38,000,000 for the erection of needed fortifications. The Committee on Appropriations, because of the condition of our finances, appropriated only about $8,000,000. Yet there are men on this floor who want to use twenty millions of that necessary saving in the building of two battle ships more than the number recommended by the Committee on Naval Affairs. They would postpone the erection of public buildings needed by the Government for the proper conduct of its business, and would deny to the underpaid Government employee an increase in salary in order that they may the more rapidly expand the naval establishment. Those of you who have in your districts rivers and harbors which are left unimproved, and who need public buildings which will not be provided for, will be in a pitiable condition before your constituents if you vote all the money to carry out an extravagant naval programme. What will the American people say of the Congress if after raising our own salaries we refuse to raise the salaries of equally as just employees of the Government, where the necessity is just as great, on the ground that we have not the money, when they learn that we waste money on an extravagant naval programme? Those who favor this programme either do not realize that there is a limit to the nation's revenues or they are absolutely indifferent as to other needs of the Government. To such a programme or policy I am unalterably opposed, and would oppose it just as vigorously if recommended by a Democratic Administration as I do when recommended by a Republican Administration. With me it is a question of rational, proper, public policy; it is not a question of partisan politics. [Applause.]

I believe first in providing such coast and harbor defense as will absolutely insure that no hostile force will ever put foot on our shores. With this provided there will, in time of war, be no demand for the Navy to furnish coast protection. Our ships can go out to sea to meet the enemy, and needing none for coast defenses and being able to send our entire fleet where the emergencies demand it, we can do with fewer ships. I believe also in maintaining an army sufficient as a nucleus, and a large, well-trained, equipped, and efficient militia, which in time of trouble can come to the relief of our standing Army while we are mobilizing the volunteers who have always been and who aways will be the bulwark of our defense. These are matters of defense, and I believe in providing them before we provide means of aggression and offense. I believe in a reasonable navy, such a navy as will protect us against dangers reasonably to be expected, while we go ahead attending to our own business, doing justice to and expecting nothing but justice of all other nations on the earth. But I do not believe in building a navy for the purpose of encouraging and engendering a jingo and bullying spirit. [Applause.] I believe that a nation, like a man, will sometimes get into trouble while trying to avoid it. I am firmly convinced that a nation, like a man, when seeking trouble will be sure always to find it. [Applause.]

Every State in this Union has a law prohibiting the carrying of arms. This is based on the theory that men who go unarmed will avoid trouble which they might not seek to avoid if they go armed. [Applause.] Now, is it not a little strange that as to individuals we enact laws upon the theory that a man when unarmed will avoid trouble, but contend that the way for a nation to avoid trouble is to go with the biggest armament in the world? [Applause.] Scorning the idea of building a navy for purposes of offense and regarding it only as a means of defense, I believe that our present Navy is in units sufficient, and that we need only to maintain the present number of units. Now, I have some pretty good authority on that proposition. In his message to the first session of the Fifty-ninth Congress the President said:

> It does not seem to me necessary, however, that the Navy should be, at least in the immediate future, increased beyond the present number of units. What is now clearly necessary is to substitute efficient for inefficient units as the latter become worn out, or as it becomes apparent that they are useless.
>
> Probably the result would be obtained by adding a single battle ship each year.

Again, in his message to the second session of the Fifty-ninth Congress, on December 3, 1906, he said:

> I do not ask that we continue to increase our Navy. I ask merely that it be maintained at its present strength, and this can be done if we replace the obsolete and outworn ships by new and good ones, the equal of any afloat in any navy.